

By Mr. HATCH: Protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union and citizens of Scotland County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union and citizens of Marion County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, protest of Farmers and Laborers' Union and citizens of Adair County, Mo., against the Brosius lard bill and for a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HEARD: Three petitions of churches of Missouri; one the Methodist Episcopal of Columbia, the second the Presbyterian of Columbia, and the Presbyterian of Nelson, against granting aid by Congress to the World's Columbian Exposition except on the condition that said Exposition shall be closed on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HOOKER of New York: Petition of Jamestown Typographical Union of New York, in favor of the passage of House bill 257, constituting eight hours a day's work—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the First Political Equality Club of Jamestown (about 150 members) in favor of granting women the right to vote—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Presbyterian Church of Chautauqua County, N. Y., against the opening of the Columbian Exposition on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HUFF: Resolutions of churches of Pennsylvania, as follows: The Apollo Lutheran, of Apollo, of 320 members; the United Presbyterian, of West Fairfield, of 100 members; the Presbyterian, of West Fairfield, of 121 members; the Presbyterian, of Congruity, of 180 members; the Reformed, of Salina, of 125 members; the Mechanicsburg, of Bethsada, and Harmony Presbyterian, of 260 members, requesting that no further aid and assistance be given to the World's Columbian Exposition unless the managers give an unequivocal and positive guaranty that it will remain closed on Sundays; and also on further condition that the sale of all intoxicating liquors shall be strictly and entirely prohibited on every part of the grounds and in all buildings used for and by the World's Columbian Exposition—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. HULL: Resolutions of the Commercial Exchange of Des Moines, Ia., asking liberal appropriations for the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of Des Moines (Ia.) Trades Labor Unions in favor of House bill 257, for a more general application of the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of the Baptist Church of Pella, Ia., demanding the closing of the World's Fair on Sunday, and the absolute prohibition of the sale of intoxicating liquors on the grounds at all times—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. LAGAN: Petition of McCloskey & Brothers, and others, merchants and business men of New Orleans, asking amendment of the oleomargarine act passed in the Forty-ninth Congress—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Petition of citizens of Atlanta, Ga., against House bill 4843—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LODGE: Resolution of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, in favor of a liberal appropriation for the review of the navies of the world—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of the Board of Trade of San Francisco, relative to amendment of interstate commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: Petition of St. Mark's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Auburn, Ind., against further assistance to the World's Fair unless the same be closed on Sunday and sale of liquor be prohibited upon the grounds—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Petition of Isaac Shook, praying for relief at the hands of Congress—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of workmen for eight-hour law—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. POST: Petition of Walnut Grange, No. 1653, of Illinois, for the passage of House bill 395, defining lard and imposing a tax thereon—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, two petitions by the same grange, one for a law to prevent the adulteration of food and drugs, and the other to prevent gambling in farm products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition by the same grange, for free delivery of rural mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SCOTT: Two petitions of the Methodist Episcopal

Church, one of Monticello, and the other of Downs, Ill., against Sunday opening of the World's Fair—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SEERLEY: Two petitions of Presbyterian churches of Iowa, one of Ainsworth and the other of Indianapolis, for the closing of the World's Fair on Sundays—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. SMITH of Illinois: Petition of the United Presbyterian Church, Randolph County, Ill., against keeping the Columbian Exposition open on Sunday and sale of liquor on grounds, etc.—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, protest of the Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association of Johnson County, Ill., against the Brosius lard bill, and for a general pure-food law—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STACKHOUSE: Letter from J. H. Bessent in reference to the establishment of a light-house at Little River, S. C.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR: Thirteen petitions, officially signed, representing 13 United Presbyterian congregations and 1,764 persons residents of the counties of Guernsey, Carroll, Columbiana, Jefferson, and Belmont, Ohio, praying that Congress take such action as will ensure the closing of the gates of the World's Fair on the Sabbath day, in accordance with the law of God, the right of man, and the precedents of American history—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

Also, two resolutions, officially signed, one representing eight congregations and numbering 2,382 members within the Eighteenth Congressional district of Ohio, and the other representing ten congregations within the counties of the Eighteenth Congressional district of Ohio, and Belmont and Tuscarawas Counties of Ohio, and numbering 1,905 persons, both protesting against any appropriation of money to the World's Fair unless the same shall be closed on the Sabbath day—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TERRY (by request): Petition against closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Protest of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church at Loveland, Colo., against any law connecting the Government with religion—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition asking that the World's Fair be closed on Sunday, etc.—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WEVER: Petition of Rev. S. D. Angell and C. L. Knapp, representing 74 others, in favor of closing the World's Fair on Sunday—to the Select Committee on the Columbian Exposition.

By Mr. WHITING: Petition of James Fitzgerald, of Point Edwards, Ontario, Canada, asking that the charge of desertion be removed from his military record—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Petition of Joseph W. Johnson, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, May 13, 1892.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to allotments to the Indians of the White Earth Agency in Minnesota, together with an opinion of the Assistant Attorney-General for the Department of the Interior relative to a bill providing for an allotment of 160 acres each to the Indians of the White Earth Agency and other Indians; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting conclusions of fact and of law in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel Snow Charlotte; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of the Main Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Covington, Ky., and a petition of the Salem Methodist Episcopal Church of Newport,

Ky., representing 300 persons, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. CAMERON presented memorials of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Salem, Pa.; of the United Brethren Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the Logan Valley Presbyterian Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Northeast, Pa.; of the Siloam Church of Booth Corner, Pa.; of the Apollo Lutheran Church of Apollo, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Loganton, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of West Fairfield, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wattsburg, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Shippensburg, Pa.; of the First Baptist Church of Bradford, Pa.; of the Presbyterian Church of Chanceford, Pa.; of the Orwigsburg Charge of the Reformed Church of Orwigsburg, Pa., remonstrating against any Government aid for the World's Columbian Exposition unless the exhibition be closed on Sunday; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented the memorial of Mrs. S. A. Brown and 57 other citizens of Warren County, Pa., remonstrating against the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. WILSON presented a petition of the Trades Assembly of Burlington, Iowa; a petition of the Trades and Labor Congress of Dubuque, Iowa; a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Sioux City, Iowa; a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Keokuk, Iowa, and a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the passage of House bill No. 257, constituting eight hours work a day's labor; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of the Presbyterian churches of New Sharon, Crystal, Dallas Center, and Lenox; of the Congregational churches of Ames and Quasqueton; of the Reformed Church of Leighton, and the Baptist church of Fairfield, all in the State of Iowa, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. ALLISON presented petitions of the Presbyterian churches of Ainsworth, Janesville, Waterloo, Goldfield, Livermore, Tipton, Mediapolis, Ireton, Tingley, Lenox, and Marengo; of the Baptist churches of Webster City and Eldora; of the First Congregational Church of Montour, and of the Ministerial Association of Keokuk, all in the State of Iowa, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. SHERMAN presented a petition of Liberty Lodge, No. 322, of Businessburg, Ohio, praying for the passage of the anti-union bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of trades and labor associations of Cleveland, Toledo, Lima, Springfield, and Zanesville, in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of House bill No. 257, constituting eight hours a day's labor; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a memorial of 36 citizens of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented petitions of four Reformed Churches of Ohio; of six Presbyterian Churches of Ohio; of six Methodist Churches of Ohio; of the Young People's Association of the First Baptist Church of Norwalk, Ohio, and of N. R. Adriance and family, of Wyoming, Ohio, praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Maryville, Mo., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Jasper County, Mo., remonstrating against the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday or committing the Government in any way to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. FAULKNER presented the memorial of Charles W. Bee and 72 other members of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Berea, W. Va., remonstrating against the union of church and

state by the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. WOLCOTT presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic Post No. 42, Department of Colorado, praying for the passage of legislation preserving and marking the battle lines at Gettysburg, Pa.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented a petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Stockwell, Ind., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

He also presented petitions of the Central Labor Union of Terre Haute, Ind.; of the Richmond Council of Labor, of Richmond, Ind.; of the Trades and Labor Council of Fort Wayne, Ind., and of the Central Labor Union of Indianapolis, Ind., praying for the passage of House bill No. 257 constituting eight hours a day's labor; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of La Porte, Westville, Union Mills, and Michigan City, all in the State of Indiana, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States prohibiting any legislation by the States respecting an establishment of religion or making an appropriation of money for any sectarian purpose; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VILAS presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Green Bay, Wis., praying for the passage of legislation for the purchase of Sturgeon Bay Canal, in the State of Wisconsin; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PERKINS presented the petition of Mattie M. Kersey, of Louisville, Kans., praying that she be granted a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Arkansas City, Kans., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of citizens of Jackson County, Oregon, praying for the passage of the Washburn-Hatch anti-union bills; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Corvallis, Oregon, and a memorial of citizens of Fairview, Oregon, remonstrating against the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a memorial of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church of Beresford, South Dakota, remonstrating against Congress committing the United States Government to a union of religion and the state by the passage of any legislation closing the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday, or in any other way committing the Government to a course of religious legislation; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. QUAY presented petitions of the Reformed Church of Salina, Pa.; of the St. Mark's Lutheran Church of Pleasant Valley, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Union City, Pa.; of the Baptist Church of Derrick, Pa.; of the Trinity Reformed Church of Altoona, Pa.; of the Fairfield Presbyterian Church of Fairfield, Pa.; of the Parnassus Methodist Episcopal Church of Parnassus, Pa.; of the Pittsfield Presbyterian Church of Pittsfield, Pa.; of the Mount Carmel Presbyterian Church of Northumberland, Pa.; of the Grace Reformed Church of Harmony, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Corry, Pa.; of the Reformed Presbyterian Church of St. Clairsville, Pa.; of the Christ Lutheran Church of Milton, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of McConnellsburg, Pa.; of the Epworth Methodist Episcopal Church of New Castle, Pa.; of the Bethany Lutheran Church of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Covenant Presbyterian Church of Harrisburg, Pa.; of the Mount Washington Presbyterian Church of Pittsburg, Pa.; of the Calvary Presbyterian Church of York, Pa.; of the First Baptist Church of West Chester, Pa.; of the English Baptist Church of Minersville, Pa.; of the Transfer Baptist Church of Mercer County, Pa.; of the Presbyterian Church of Covington, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of West Alexander, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Kittanning, Pa.; of the Christ Church of York, Pa.; of the Simpson Methodist Episcopal Church of Erie, Pa.; of the Tasker Methodist Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Rebersburg, Pa.; of the St. Luke's Reformed Church of Bradock, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Susquehanna, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Mount Pleasant, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Venice, Pa.; of the Beulah

Presbyterian Church of Beulah, Pa.; of the St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Montgomery County, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Minersville, Pa.; of the Zion Evangelical Episcopal Church of Dauphin, Pa.; of the Grace Evangelical Church of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Reformed Lutheran Church of Berks, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Pigeon Creek, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Darby, Pa.; of the East Vincent Reformed Church of Chester, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Hawley, Pa.; of the Miners' Congregational Church of Plains, Pa.; of the English Lutheran Church of Jersey Shore, Pa.; of the St. Luke's Lutheran Church of Roaring Spring, Pa.; of the Pottsgrove Lutheran Church of Pottsgrove, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Greensfield, Pa.; of the St. James' Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bucks County, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Fisherville, Pa.; of the Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church of York, Pa.; of the Grace Presbyterian Church of Jenkintown, Pa.; of the Apollo Lutheran Church of Apollo, Pa.; of the First Welsh Congregational Church of Scranton, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the United Brethren Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Fairfield, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Wattsburg, Pa.; of the Pilgrim Congregational Church of Plymouth, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Lower Chanceford, Pa.; of the Eaton Baptist Church of Eaton, Pa.; of the Second Presbyterian Church of Williamsport, Pa.; of the St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Spring Grove, Pa.; of the Wayne Methodist Episcopal Church of Wayne, Pa.; of the Phoenix Baptist Church of Pleasant Mount, Pa.; of the Buena Vista Methodist Episcopal Church of Allegheny City, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Mount Washington, Pa.; of the Presbyterian Church of Scottsdale, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Rimersburg, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Prospect, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Evansburg, Pa.; of the First Baptist Church of Canton, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Milroy, Pa.; of the Trinity Presbyterian Church of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Olwit Presbyterian Church of Moore, Pa.; of the First Congregational Church of Pittston, Pa.; of the Mariner's Bethel Methodist Episcopal Church of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Marcus Hook Baptist Church of Marcus Hook, Pa.; of the St. John's Lutheran Church of Lancaster City, Pa.; of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Loganton, Pa.; of the Harmony Presbyterian Church of Brandt, Pa.; of the First Presbyterian Church of Troy, Pa.; of the St. James' Evangelical Lutheran Church of Huntingdon, Pa.; of the First Baptist Church of Antrim, Pa.; of the Media Presbyterian Church of Media, Pa.; of the Centennial Presbyterian Church of Jeffersonville, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Greenfield, Pa.; of the Presbyterian Church of Slate Lick, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Meyersdale, Pa.; of the Trinity Lutheran Church of Lancaster, Pa.; of the United Presbyterian Church of Espyville, Pa.; of the Logan's Valley Baptist Church of Bellwood, Pa.; of the Mount Moriah Baptist Church of Smithfield, Pa.; of the Everett Baptist Church of Everett, Pa.; of the Williamsburg Presbyterian Church of Williamsburg, Pa.; of the Plains Presbyterian Church of Plains, Pa.; of the Zion Evangelical Lutheran Church of Sunbury, Pa.; of St. Stephen's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Philadelphia, Pa.; of the Olivet Presbyterian Church of Reading, Pa.; of the Bates Fork Baptist Church of Sycamore, Pa.; of the Presbyterian Church of Pigeon Creek, Pa.; of the Center Presbyterian Church of New Park, Pa.; of the St. John's Lutheran Church of Easton, Pa.; of the Presbyterian churches of Lower Marsh Creek and Great Conowago, Pa.; of the Middle Octorara Presbyterian Church of Bart, Pa.; of the First Baptist Church of Chester, Pa.; of the Lutheran churches of Duncansville and Geeseytown, Pa.; of the Emanuel and St. John's Evangelical Lutheran churches of Prospect, Pa.; of the Union Presbyterian Church of West Fairfield, Pa.; of the St. Luke's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Center Hall, Pa.; of the Bird in Hand Charge of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pennsylvania; of the Buena Vista Street Methodist Episcopal Church of Allegheny, Pa.; of the St. Luke's Reformed Church of Braddock, Pa.; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Pleasantville, Pa.; of the Presbyterian Church of Duncannon, Pa.; of the Great Bethel Baptist Church of Uniontown, Pa.; of the Bridge Street Presbyterian Church of Catsaqua, Pa.; and of the St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church of Mahanoy City, Pa., praying for the closing of the World's Columbian Exposition on Sunday and that the sale of intoxicating liquors be prohibited thereat; which were referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. HIGGINS presented a petition of citizens of Wilmington, Del., praying that the World's Columbian Exposition be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the Quadro-Centennial (Select).

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of the Trades and Labor

Union of St. Louis, Mo.; a petition of the Central Labor Union of Springfield, Mo., and a petition of the Federation of Labor Union of the District of Columbia, praying for the passage of House bill No. 257 constituting eight hours a day's work; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the establishment by the Government of a telegraph system and the operation of its own lines in connection with the postal system; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

On motion of Mr. FAULKNER, it was
Ordered, That when the Senate adjourn to-day, it be to meet on Monday next.

IRRIGATION PUBLICATIONS OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting statements furnished by the Director of the Geological Survey and the Superintendent of the Census, in response to a resolution of the Senate of the 20th ultimo, requesting information as to the reports which have been printed, as well as such as are in preparation in said offices, relating to irrigation and the reclamation of arid lands; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, and ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 7818) to provide for certain of the most urgent deficiencies in the appropriations for the service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1892, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1867) to incorporate the Washington, Fairfax and Alexandria Railway Company, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 3133) to incorporate the Washington, Fairfax, and Alexandria Railway Company; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WOLCOTT, from the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment, to whom was referred the bill (S. 819) to amend the act of January 16, 1883, "To regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 770) for the better protection of the public service, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1598) to insure preference in appointment, employment, and retention therein, in the public service of the United States, to veterans of the late war, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3042) to provide for leave of absence to certain members of the Grand Army of the Republic during the encampment of the Grand Army of the Republic in the city of Washington, D. C., during the month of September, 1892, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2845) regulating the sale of distilled and fermented liquors in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported adversely thereon, and they were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 3112) to regulate the sale of distilled and fermented liquors in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1571) to regulate liquor licenses in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 398) to provide for the removal of saloons, breweries, and distilleries in Washington City on the complaint of persons residing in their immediate vicinity; and

A bill (S. 1693) to prohibit the manufacture and sale of spirituous and intoxicating liquors in the District of Columbia.

Mr. VILAS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2859) to provide for the sale of the unsold portion of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, reported it without amendment.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. FRYE. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce to report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 7820) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preserva-

tion of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. FRYE. I accompany it with a general report, and also, in compliance with the order of the Senate, with a report on each item contained in the bill. I ask that the bill and reports may be printed, and that 100 additional copies to the usual number may be printed for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Of both bill and report?

Mr. FRYE. Of both bill and report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine asks that the report and bill be printed in the usual number, and that 100 additional copies of each be printed for the use of the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FRYE. I am authorized by the Committee on Commerce to say that this is a bill for two years, and that none will be reported from that committee at the next session of the present Congress. I give notice that on Tuesday morning next, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of this bill.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 3126) to regulate the times for holding the terms of the United States courts in the State of South Dakota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3127) granting a pension to Amos Potter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3128) to amend section 16, of chapter 405, of an act of Congress approved March 2, 1889, relating to the reservation of the Sioux Nation of Indians in South Dakota, by extending the time within which the Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway Company may construct its line of railroad across said reservation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3129) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Watson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 3130) authorizing the Commissioner of the General Land Office to issue a land patent to George W. and Lottie Rogers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PERKINS introduced a bill (S. 3131) granting an honorable discharge to Benjamin Head; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 3132) for the purchase of a site and the erection of a mint thereon in the city of Philadelphia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

AMENDMENT TO BILLS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to present, on behalf of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT], an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 853) to promote and encourage the display of the flag of the United States was indefinitely postponed, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs. I have the consent of the Senator who reported the bill to make this request.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

KLAMATH INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 38) to provide for the disposal and sale of lands known as the Klamath River Indian Reservation have met, and after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the amendment of the Senate be amended as follows:

On page 3, strike out the word "and," at the end of line 8, and strike out the word "preemption," at the beginning of line 9.

Insert the word "stone" after the word "mineral," in line 9.

After the word "thereof," in line 21, insert the following:

"Provided, That lands settled upon, improved, and now occupied by set-

tlers in good faith by qualified persons under the land laws shall be exempt from such allotment unless one or more of said Indians have resided upon said tract in good faith for four months prior to the passage of this act."

R. F. PETTIGREW

H. L. DAWES,

On the part of the Senate.

THOS. LYNCH,

JOHN L. WILSON,

On the part of the House.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I wish to state that the amendment to which the conference committee agree was suggested by the Senator from California [Mr. FELTON]. He had supposed that it was incorporated in the original bill as it passed the Senate, and it was agreed to by the conference committee. I ask for the adoption of the report.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to hear what change the amendment makes in the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. It makes simply this change: It provides that in allotting lands to Indians those lands which are occupied in good faith by actual settlers shall be exempt from allotment unless one or more Indians reside upon those lands and have resided upon the lands for four months prior to the passage of the act. Through some misunderstanding quite a number of settlers went upon this reservation, it being an Executive-order reservation. By conflicting decisions of the Indian Department they went upon it in good faith, and we wish to protect their interests, so that their lands, where they have built houses and made improvements, shall not be allotted to Indians who did not occupy them. That is all.

Mr. SANDERS. I should like to inquire if this legislation provides that Indians may go upon settlers' possessions and secure allotments hereafter?

Mr. PETTIGREW. It provides that they shall not.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the conference report may be printed, so that we may look at it.

Mr. SANDERS. Is that consistent with our legislation upon such subjects?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I leave the Senator to answer that question for himself.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report be printed and go over.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Very well; let it be printed and go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The conference report will be printed, and the bill and report will lie on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 2699) to repeal section 16, chapter 294, of the act approved July 15, 1870, making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1871, relating to brevets.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7360) authorizing the construction of a wagon and motor bridge over the Missouri at St. Charles, Mo.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House of Representatives had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (H. R. 507) to provide for a term of the United States circuit and districts courts at Evanston, Wyo.;

A bill (H. R. 724) granting a pension to Jane Shierry;

A bill (H. R. 4288) authorizing the payment of the pension of Edward S. Smith, accrued at the date of his death, to his mother, Catherine;

A bill (H. R. 4533) for the relief of the holders of drawback certificates issued under an act of Congress approved June 2, 1890; and

A bill (H. R. 6658) to vacate that part of Madison street, Georgetown, west of Back street, and extend Y street, in Burleigh, in the District of Columbia.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had this day approved and signed the act (S. 4) for the relief of Alfred J. Worcester.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If not, the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. HALE. I ask that the naval appropriation bill be proceeded with.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7093) making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1893, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending question is on

the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] to the text of the bill.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from New Jersey will let me make one or two corrections?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. On page 4, line 2, I move to strike out the word "coats" and insert "coasts."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. On page 4, line 3, I move to strike out "ten" and insert "fourteen;" so as to read: "\$14,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I should like to have the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey read again.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed to the text of the bill will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 16, it is moved to insert:

Naval reservation, Algiers, La.: Toward the construction of a dry dock at Algiers, La., in accordance with the recommendation of the two commissions, and for the purchase of such land as is shown by the report of said commission to be necessary for this purpose, in addition to the present Government reservation, \$250,000; and the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to make a contract for the construction of the said dry dock, the cost thereof not to exceed \$840,000.

Mr. HALE. Does the Senator from New Jersey report this amendment from the Naval Committee?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Yes, sir; it was so reported by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON]. Do I understand that the Committee on Appropriations will accept the amendment without any controversy? If so, it is unnecessary for me to occupy any of the time of the Senate.

I will state, however, briefly the facts. This plan is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy; it has been recommended by two boards of naval officers who were appointed and have already reported to the Navy Department; it is recommended by the Senate Naval Committee; it is also recommended, I understand, by the House Naval Committee, as being the only practicable point anywhere in the Gulf where a dry dock or a part of a naval establishment for the accommodation of naval vessels, and also commercial ships, where they can be taken out of the water. I think the recommendations which have been made respecting it by the Navy Department and by all parties who have investigated the subject should be a sufficient recommendation to the Committee on Appropriations to allow the amendment to become a part of the bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. May I ask the Senator from New Jersey a question?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Certainly.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand that this work was recommended by the same commission that went to the Pacific coast and recommended a dry dock on Puget Sound?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think that it has become the settled policy of this Government to establish dry docks at different points, both on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. It does not imply any naval establishments of any nature or character, because at the point where these docks are located private parties will build up machine shops. The result will be that a ship disabled from any cause, whether a naval ship or a commercial ship, will have some convenient location where it can be taken out of the water, and if wounded in any respect it may be repaired. We established one at Puget Sound. There is a dry dock at San Francisco. There is none in the Gulf of Mexico at any point whatever, and really there is no other point except at Algiers, where it is proposed to locate this dock, where it is possible or practicable to establish such a dock.

It seems to me that it has been a very well established fact that if we are to have naval engagements in the future they are most likely to take place somewhere in the Gulf at or near where the great interoceanic canals are being projected, and certainly in a very short time will be built. Therefore, the Committee on Naval Affairs recommend that a dry dock be built at Algiers as the only practicable point on the Gulf, and the necessity exists why there should be one in the Gulf, not only for commercial but for naval purposes.

Mr. HALE. I am not authorized to accept the amendment for the committee, but it is not subject to a point of order, and is a matter for the consideration of the Senate. These dry docks, as the Senator has said, are largely valuable, not simply in connection with the Navy, but in connection with the wants of our commercial marine. I have no doubt myself, from my examination into the subject, that a dry dock would be of great use in that way at this place.

Mr. MITCHELL. I will state in this connection that recently, within the last two months, the Government has been humiliated by having to send one of her ships into the dry dock at Esquimaux, on English soil, in order to have her repaired, there being no dry dock accessible. However, one is being constructed

now at Tacoma to do that kind of work. I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the amendment be again read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be again read.

The Chief Clerk read Mr. MCPHERSON'S amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to inquire where the money to be expended in this way is to come from. We had just as well face the matter squarely and honestly and frankly. If the increase is made in this bill and the large amount provided in the other House shall be sustained, there will not be money in the Treasury to meet these requisitions upon it, and we must provide increased revenue.

Now, I am not discussing what has caused this condition, or anything about it. It is a fact, and we must realize and recognize it, and legislate accordingly. This is not a matter of absolute importance. It is a matter that will do just as well a year or two years hence. I sympathize with the distinguished Senators from Louisiana in their anxiety to have this money expended there; but is it a matter of necessity? I simply want to record my vote against the amendment.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I want to say also, as a matter of caution to the Senate of the United States, that we are not able now to expend any more money than the regular appropriations. Where the law requires an appropriation, or a treaty requires it, I think we ought to carry it out and make provision for it. I propose myself, so far as I am concerned, at this stage of public affairs, in the present condition of the revenues and expenditures, not to vote for any proposition that is not regularly estimated for in the estimates or which is not provided for by existing law or treaty. I think any other course would not be safe for the Senate or for Congress to take.

There is another thing. We all know very well that in the tariff law we surrendered a very large revenue from sugar. Besides that we assumed the burden of paying a bounty on domestic sugar. I believe in that policy, but the policy necessarily requires the Senate, if it acts according to its duty, having participated in that legislation, to curtail the expenses of the Government accordingly.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, we can not hear on this side.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio will please suspend. There is so much talking in the Chamber that the Senator from Ohio can not be heard. Senators will please abstain from audible conversation.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think I have said all I desire to say. It is simply this, that we can not make appropriations for more than the amount of revenue. We should not within \$10,000,000 or \$20,000,000 appropriate to the amount of revenue received, because it is a great deal better to have a surplus than a deficit. Every man in his private affairs knows that very well. Since the Government has reduced its income by, as I think, a proper reduction of taxation, it must reduce or limit its expenditures to the amount of money properly collectible under our present revenue law.

Therefore, unless the Committee on Appropriations, which is responsible for expenditures and which will be held responsible by the country, recommends this appropriation, or it is formally estimated for, I feel disposed to stand by them in resisting any new appropriation not expressly provided for by law or treaty or demanded in the ordinary course of the Government and in the public estimates.

Mr. HALE. The Senator understands that this provision was not incorporated in the bill by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; there is another consideration in regard to dry docks. Unless you intend to make a dry dock of stone or iron, it is utterly futile to make a dry dock in the Gulf of Mexico of any kind of wood, because we very well know that the insect there, which is very small but very formidable and very fatal, will destroy almost any timber in a short time.

Mr. MCPHERSON. At this point it is claimed by those who have investigated the matter that there is no danger of anything of that kind. It is so reported in regard to this location by the naval experts who have examined it.

Mr. SHERMAN. I supposed the difficulty abounded throughout the whole of the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. MCPHERSON. No, it does not.

Mr. SHERMAN. I supposed that difficulty had to be dealt with of the timber being destroyed by insects in a year or two. However, that is not the point upon which I rose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CHANDLER. By direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, after line 16, it is proposed to insert:

Toward the construction of a dock at Portsmouth navy-yard of such size, design, and material as may be determined by the Secretary of the Navy, the sum of \$100,000, under a limit of \$500,000 as the total cost of said dock.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to say in reference to this proposition that there is no fixed dock at the Portsmouth navy-yard. The only dock that has ever existed there has been what is called a balance dock, or a lifting dock. It has served its purpose very well for all these years, but it is now worn out; it is obsolete; and it would be futile to expend any more money upon this old dock. Therefore, unless the Portsmouth yard is to be no longer used for the repair of ships, it is necessary to provide new dock accommodations.

The appropriation which is now proposed, and which has been adopted by the Naval Committee, is recommended by the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Commodore Farquhar, in his report to the Secretary of the Navy of October 14, 1891. What he says is repeated in Report No. 491 of the Committee on Naval Affairs at the present session. I will read what the commodore says:

The balance dry dock at this station requires extensive repairs. It is of wood and has been in constant use for forty years, but as its capacity is not beyond 3,500 tons it is useless for the larger vessels, and therefore I do not recommend that a large sum be expended upon its repairs. If this yard is to be maintained a new dry dock is required. It is believed that by taking advantage of the channel, the bottom and sides of which are between the two islands which compose this yard, closing one end and putting a gate at the other, with the necessary pumping machinery, a stone dock capable of docking the largest ships will be obtained at a comparatively small outlay. As this yard with its fine climate is a sanitarium for ships to go to after a cruise in the tropics to refit, it is recommended that steps be taken to construct this dock by appropriating \$100,000 to commence.

The committee in their report sum up the advantages of the Portsmouth yard as follows:

1. It is the most northerly naval station on the Atlantic coast, and therefore the most salubrious, and is indispensable for a sanitary station.
2. It has a large area of acres costing little, not very valuable for sale, but admirably adapted for all the purposes of a yard and station now and in the distant future.
3. The buildings and improvements have cost upwards of \$4,000,000, and remain in every way fitted for the business of the Navy.
4. The yard is easy of access, with ample depth of water for the largest ships, and notwithstanding its northerly situation, the channel never freezes.
5. The location is between two towns, one of 3,000 and the other of 10,000 population, which afford facilities for procuring the necessary mechanics, and is not in the heart of the city occupying ground needed for the city's growth and of too high value to be monopolized in large area for work which can be as well performed at a greater distance.

Upon these considerations the committee think the Portsmouth navy-yard should be retained and made efficient, not necessarily as an iron or steel building workshop, but as a repair shop and northerly naval station of great value and importance to the public interests.

I call the attention of the Senate, and I call the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], to the fact, that a very large sum of money is not needed at the present time in order to commence this dock. It is not to be constructed without considerable preparation of the ground, because it is to be built in the channel between two islands. There is a natural configuration of the surface of the yard, which makes it easy and comparatively inexpensive to construct this dock, but the money that is now asked for is needed only to commence the excavation between the two islands.

Under those circumstances, as there can be no doubt at all that dock accommodations are to be provided at the Portsmouth yard, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment which I have reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs and let the work of excavation be commenced, and the additional appropriations which are needed for the yard can be made at a future day.

Mr. GORMAN. I trust that the Senate will dispose of this amendment as it did the one in regard to a dock on the Gulf coast. There can not be any question that these docks are desirable and will probably become a necessity in the near future. The one the Senate disposed of a few moments ago by voting it down, in my opinion is of much more value to the country than the one now proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], for there is no dock south of Norfolk to which vessels can now go for repairs.

The warning given by my distinguished friend from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] of the condition of the Treasury comes with great force, because it is true. Therefore, in framing this bill, while the committee elsewhere dwelt upon the necessity of these docks, it was thought best there, as it was thought best here, to postpone action at this time. There is no necessity for the immediate expenditure of money for practical work at this time. Whatever amount can be spared from the Treasury had better be devoted to the building of ships, and we can build these docks hereafter. The building of ships is a great work, which must go on, or else we paralyze the entire industry; but in this case there is no necessity for making an appropriation now, and, as I said a moment

ago, there is not half the necessity for the one proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire as for the one on the Gulf. Therefore I trust, with a desire on the part of all sides to build up and make the Navy what it should be, and as fast as the condition of the Treasury will warrant, that these small attendant navy-yards and docks and all other structures which are not necessary for the moment, may wait until we are in a better financial condition.

Mr. CHANDLER. I desire to notice the remark of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] that there is not so much need of this appropriation for the Portsmouth dock as there was for the appropriation for the dock at Algiers, La., which the Senate has just declined to make. The difference is this: There is no naval station yet established at Algiers, there is no work to be done there, the naval station is yet to be created; and, therefore, the appropriation for a dock at that point, although I think it ought to be made if the station is to be established, might well enough be deferred a year. In this case, however, the old balance dock or lifting dock at Portsmouth is becoming utterly useless, and it is a waste of money to repair it, as the Navy Department report. If there is to be a dock there, there is a need that work upon it should proceed immediately.

Therefore, I submit that the case in that respect is a little better than that involved in the proposition to commence the construction of a dock at Algiers, particularly as I only ask that money enough be given to commence the excavation between the two islands where this dock is to be located, and I ask the Senator from Maryland whether, under those circumstances, he would not think it advisable to appropriate \$100,000, or, if not \$100,000, at least \$50,000, with which to commence this work? I hope the Senator from Maryland will take that view of this proposition.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, the difference between these two propositions is that from Norfolk down the whole coast there is not a place where you can run a war vessel and have it repaired and put it on the dry dock in all that immense stretch of country.

Mr. CHANDLER. There is one at Port Royal, the Senator will remember.

Mr. GORMAN. At Port Royal there is one, but it is not in condition yet. There is a little dry dock that will come along hereafter. The Department thinks that the dock at Algiers is the most necessary. It is practically a new dock at each place. The distinction is that we should have to buy the land at one place and in the other ships can run into the Brooklyn and Boston yards for repairs. It is one of those cases where we think the appropriation may properly be deferred; but the appropriation now, even of a small amount, would create an obligation to go on with the work, which, in our judgment, will delay the greater work of the construction of ships.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, to reject the proposition to build a dry dock at Algiers and then in turn to authorize the construction of a dry dock at Portsmouth, seems to me the very height of absurdity. The Government of the United States should proceed in an intelligent manner, in a manner which I think was recommended by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] while serving as Secretary of the Navy, and whose administration of that Department was a very intelligent one and a very successful one. I think that while Secretary he first inaugurated the movement looking towards the abandonment of certain navy-yards along the Atlantic coast. The whole coast line is dotted with them from the further end of Maine clear down to Florida. We have one at Portsmouth, which is absolutely unnecessary and a foolish expenditure of money. We are year after year maintaining an old rookery of an establishment, and repairing old buildings, when the navy-yard is suitable for nothing in the world except for repairing old wooden ships.

Now, come down to Boston a few miles, and what do you find there? A naval establishment which is a positive disgrace to this Government in all its outward appearances. On a visit paid to that yard last summer by the Naval Committee, I found that there was a large establishment, the value of which was estimated at about \$6,000,000, and for which I was informed \$6,000,000 had been offered for the plant, principally the property, by certain great railroad corporations coming into the city of Boston. What were we doing? Expending hundreds of thousands of dollars every year for its maintenance, and the only work done in that yard was making anchor chains and rope or cordage for use upon vessels. All the material produced by the work done in that yard might have been purchased from private establishments at one-tenth part of the cost which the Government was sustaining in maintaining the establishment.

Sir, it is very evident that as soon as common sense takes the place of political considerations in the management of these naval establishments along the coast about three-fourths of them will be abandoned, and among them, as I take it, one of the first

to be abandoned will be that at Portsmouth. Another that ought to be abandoned at once and sold by the Government is the navy-yard at Boston. The torpedo station at Newport, which is entirely exposed to fire from an enemy's ship, and which can not be protected in any way, shape, or form possible, ought to be removed from there and placed in some other position. Here is another naval establishment in New London, another at Brooklyn, N. Y., another at League Island, Philadelphia, another at Norfolk, Va., another at Pensacola, Fla., all of which should be concentrated in two great establishments on the Atlantic coast, and every dollar of money expended should be expended in accordance with some intelligent plan, where every dollar of money would have its effect in providing the necessary appliances not only for building ships, but for taking ships out of the water and repairing them.

To begin the work of constructing a dry dock at Portsmouth is simply continuing the mistakes of the past, and intensifying and increasing them, for, as I said, and I repeat it, when other considerations than political considerations begin, as I hope they soon will, and have a controlling influence in shaping legislation in regard to these useless naval establishments upon our coast, they will all be concentrated in one or two large establishments. We should have two upon the Atlantic Coast, at least two, but no more than two; we should have one on the Pacific coast, and there should be concentrated the whole power and expenditure of the Government in creating establishments similar to those which have been created in other countries. Other great nations make no such mistakes, and I think we should not make them.

Speaking of the construction of a dry dock at New Orleans, I have no objection to the construction of these dry docks. I think they ought to be constructed at different points along the coast, but I would not have them very close together. There is no dry dock in the Gulf of Mexico, and it is proposed to supply that want by constructing a dry dock at New Orleans. But aside from that I can see no necessity anywhere for any appropriation of money for dry docks, and certainly not at Portsmouth, N. H.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am not going to discuss with the Senator from New Jersey his proposition that the naval establishment should be concentrated into three or, at most, four yards, or two on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific coast. In many respects, I agree with him about that; but while the present policy is pursued, I do not wish to be considered as assenting to what he has said about the navy-yard at Portsmouth, N. H., or Kittery, Me. It is at present one of the most valuable yards. In all matters of repair, in the skill of the workmen there, the climate, the desirability of expending money there with the certainty of getting the amount of money's worth, as shown by demonstrations, are as great in the Portsmouth yard as any other yard, and until we adopt the policy of concentrating everything in three or four large yards, such yards ought to be maintained and encouraged.

I do not propose to discuss the question about this appropriation. The Senate has already acted on the one proposed at Algiers, La., and I am entirely willing it should take the vote on the pending amendment now.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in reference to the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON]. The Senator began this morning by moving a very large appropriation, beginning with an \$850,000 appropriation—

Mr. McPHERSON. Where it was needed.

Mr. CHANDLER. For Algiers, La., and he ended by making what I conceive to be a very good speech against his own proposition, because the Senator has gone on to say that we need no workshops and practically no docks anywhere, except at two navy-yards upon the Atlantic coast and one upon the Pacific coast, and that we should there concentrate the work of the Government. Having come to this conclusion, the Senator proceeds with one hand to wipe out of existence the Portsmouth yard, and with the other hand to brush away the Boston yard. Not content with that, he disposes of the naval station at Newport, R. I., by saying that that is utterly useless. The Senator, therefore, has disposed of every vestige of a New England naval establishment, and proposes to make the most northerly yard the yard at New York, which is connected with the waters which wash the shores of the Senator's own State.

I think, Mr. President, that the Senator is mistaken in his opinion that outside of the three principal yards all the naval stations should be abandoned, and there should be no docks anywhere else. I have no more than has the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] any issue with the Senator from New Jersey upon the proposition that the Government work should be done mainly in two of the Atlantic yards and one of the Pacific yards; but while that is being done, I am of opinion, and so say the best judges of this subject, that we should have several docks at other points where the steel ships of the new Navy, which will re-

quire docking frequently, can be taken into dock and their bottoms cleansed and proper repairs can be made. That is the policy advocated by the naval experts, and it is one which is in accordance with the true interest of the country. Therefore it is that we have built a dock at League Island; therefore it is that we are to build a dock at Port Royal and a dock on Puget Sound, and that is the reason why the Senator makes a motion that we shall build a dock at Algiers, La.—

Mr. McPHERSON. Would it interfere with the Senator if I should ask him a question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. CHANDLER. At the end of this sentence—

Not because it is contemplated to establish at any one of these points a great naval workshop in competition with the workshops at New York, at Norfolk, and at Mare Island.

Mr. McPHERSON. Now that we are building no more wooden ships and are repairing no more wooden ships, for which these different yards were created, would the Senator recommend as a permanent policy for this Government the continuance of these yards?

Mr. CHANDLER. I would not recommend—

Mr. McPHERSON. There is the whole point.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator has not heard my answer; the Senator replied to my answer before he heard it.

I would not continue the policy of making all these yards great naval workshops. My views upon this subject are to be found, voluminously I am afraid, in print, and there is nothing in what I am now saying inconsistent with anything which I have heretofore advocated, and that is, that while we concentrate the work of repairing and of constructing ships, if we do construct them, in these three great yards, in one of which the Senator's State has a very great interest, we should also retain those other stations in order that ships may be docked there and in order that repairs may be made there when occasion is afforded.

I am not certain that there should be maintained a navy-yard at Portsmouth and at Boston both, but I am certain that either at Portsmouth or at Boston there should be maintained a Northern repair shop and a northerly naval station, and the reasons therefor are set out in the report to which I have already alluded.

I am not disposed to quarrel with the Senate, which has refused to vote the appropriation for the Louisiana dock, if it does not vote at this time to commence the work upon the dock at Portsmouth, which I know will have to be commenced and will be commenced in due time; but I am led by this sweeping condemnation which the Senator from New Jersey has passed upon the Portsmouth yard, the Boston yard, and the Newport naval station, to say that I do not think that the Senator's views upon this subject are in accordance with the true policy of the Government with reference to the construction of docks for the repair and construction of naval vessels.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I do not care to discuss the merits of this amendment as to the necessity of a dock at Portsmouth, but I wish to enter a mild protest against the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON], even though they were incidentally, perhaps, sanctioned by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER]. To sell out all of the navy-yards but those at New York and Norfolk and concentrate everything of the Navy in those two places would not be economical. It would be a violation of the common-sense principles of defense. I do not care whether there are more than those two great yards for the building of great steel vessels of war; perhaps two are quite enough for that purpose; but what would you think if a vessel were engaged in a sharp action off the coast of Maine and should be obliged to run around to New York for want of some necessary special repairs that might be made in three days if there were facilities near at hand, when she would be again ready for action.

We have those large yards at Portsmouth and Boston. If they are larger than are necessary to be kept as stations for supplies and repairs, let them be reduced in area. But, in addition to the great yards which the Senator from New Jersey speaks of, there must be other stations where a ship can be quickly repaired, and where she can renew her supplies. If you dispense with them, and there should be a prospect of difficulty, it would become the duty of the Government to go and hire some big warehouses to store some implements and tools of repair, powder, shot, food, and various things necessary to repair and supply a vessel. There would be no economy in it, and you would leave your Navy in a very awkward condition in time of war.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, I ask that the Secretary

may resume the reading of the bill, commencing with the paragraph on page 39, where the reading was left off last night.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill, beginning on line 19, page 39, as follows:

INCREASE OF THE NAVY.

That for the purpose of further increasing the naval establishment of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to have constructed, by contract, one armored cruiser of about 8,000 tons displacement of the general type of armored cruiser numbered 2 (New York), to cost, exclusive of armament, not more than \$3,500,000, excluding any premium that may be paid for increased speed and the cost of armament. The contract for the construction of said cruiser shall contain provisions to the effect that the contractor guarantees that when completed and tested for speed, under conditions to be prescribed by the Navy Department, it shall exhibit a speed of at least 20 knots per hour; and for every quarter knot of speed so exhibited above said guaranteed speed the contractor shall receive a premium over and above the contract price of \$50,000; and for every quarter knot that such vessel fails of reaching said guaranteed speed there shall be deducted from the contract price the sum of \$50,000. In the construction of said vessel all the provisions of the act of August 3, 1893, entitled "An act to increase the naval establishment," as to material for said vessel, its engines, boilers, and machinery, the contract under which it is built, the notice of and proposals for the same, the plans, drawings, specifications therefor, and the method of executing said contract, shall be observed and followed, and said vessel shall be built in compliance with the terms of said act, save that in all its parts said vessel shall be of domestic manufacture. If the Secretary of the Navy shall be unable to contract at reasonable prices for the building of said vessel, then he may build such vessel in such navy-yard as he may designate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wish to enter my protest against that portion of the House bill as an unnecessary expenditure of money at this time, which can be readily dispensed with. I simply wish to record that I am opposed to this provision of the bill as it came from the House of Representatives, and I am also opposed to the provisions in the amendment adding one sea-going coast-line battle ship and one harbor-defense double-turret ship of the monitor type. I should be perfectly willing to compromise and strike out the vessels inserted by the House, and these two large vessels provided for by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and take the four light-draft gunboats and the six torpedo boats. I think that would be ample, and as much as the condition of the Treasury will justify at this time.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriation for "Increase of the Navy," on page 41, after line 2, to insert:

Also one sea-going coast-line battle ship, designed to carry the heaviest armor and most powerful ordnance, with a displacement of about 9,000 tons, to have the highest practicable speed for vessels of its class, and to cost, exclusive of armament and of any premiums that may be paid for increased speed, not exceeding \$4,000,000; one harbor-defense double-turret ship of the monitor type, with a displacement of about 7,500 tons, to have the highest practicable speed for vessels of its class, and to cost, exclusive of armament and of any premiums that may be paid for increased speed, not exceeding \$3,000,000; four light-draft gunboats of from 800 to 1,200 tons displacement, with the highest practicable speed for vessels of their class, and to cost, exclusive of armament and of any premiums that may be paid for increased speed, not exceeding \$450,000 each; and six torpedo boats, at a cost of not exceeding \$110,000 each; and not more than two of said torpedo boats shall be built at one establishment.

In the construction of all said vessels, following the provision for the construction of the one armored cruiser of about 8,000 tons displacement, the provisions of the act of August 3, 1893, entitled "An act to increase the naval establishment," shall be observed and followed in the same manner that the provisions of said act are applied to the construction of said armored cruiser; and in the contracts for the construction of each of said vessels, besides the armored cruiser before named, such provisions for minimum speed and for premiums for increased speed and penalties for deficient speed may be made, subject to the terms of this act, as in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy may be deemed advisable.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I desire to offer some amendments to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations. I offer the amendments as the organ of the Naval Committee of the Senate. They are three in number.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first amendment to the amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, in line 8 of the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, it is proposed to strike out the word "one" and insert "three;" and in line 9, after the word "type," to insert "designed to carry the heaviest armor and the most powerful ordnance;" so as to read:

Three harbor-defense double-turret ships of the monitor type designed to carry the heaviest armor and the most powerful ordnance, etc.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, this is not a question of more ships, but of better ships to meet an immediate, a pressing need. The question presented in my amendment is simply this: Shall we continue at great cost to build, to equip, and maintain in commission a class of battle ships the country does not now need, and in all human probability never will need, or shall we stop this wild, reckless expenditure of the people's money for useless things and give them in exchange for their money something they ask for and have asked for in vain for years, to wit, adequate protection to our extended seacoast commerce and our great seaport cities?

While we have escaped war for twenty years and more, there have been many rumors of possible war, and on every such occasion the

people have been reminded that in respect of all our great commercial cities on the Atlantic and Pacific a single third-rate naval vessel of any country, greater or small, could enter unchallenged any and all of our seaport cities, bombard and burn them to ashes. We were reminded of the absolutely defenseless condition of the port of San Francisco when recently threatened with annihilation by Chile; we are daily reminded in the great metropolitan newspapers that the port of New York is without a fort, a gun, or a ship worthy the name to protect that great city from invasion by sea.

This is equally true of every seaport on the Atlantic coast. And yet the order is, "Build more cruisers, more battle ships." Of cruisers we will have twenty-two in commission by 1894, all ships of great power and speed; and let it be remembered, we have added two more during the past week, the City of Paris and the City of New York, and possibly five others of the same line, in much less time than it will take us to build them—say, then, thirty cruisers, while others stand outside anxious and waiting to be taken into the naval reserve. As to these commercial ships they are not one dollar of expense to the Government unless the Government is required to use them in the Navy. Let it be further remembered we have no ships in foreign commerce, and we are at war with no commercial nation, and what is infinitely better still, we never expect to be at war with anybody if war can with honor be avoided. Neither the cruisers nor the so-called battle ships are of any account whatever in the protection of our coast.

Therefore the Committee on Naval Affairs directed me to offer the amendments I have had the honor to offer as an addition to the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee in respect naval increase.

My amendment provides that three coast-defense vessels be built in lieu of the one vessel provided in the pending bill; that ten torpedo-boats be built instead of six. For the purchase of torpedo boats and torpedoes \$1,000,000 is appropriated.

I am aware that there is a seeming unwillingness on the part of the House of Representatives to add much by way of increase to the Navy, all of which is evidenced by the bill sent here by the House; and in my humble opinion the recommendation of the House to build one more cruising ship is a recommendation in the wrong direction, and I criticize with more emphasis the action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in recommending an additional battle ship. We are not suffering for the want of more cruisers or more battle ships, while the neglect of Congress to provide at once for more adequate coast defense is deserving of all the censure it is receiving.

In support of the amendment I had the honor to offer—I desire to say a few words. The recommendation of the committee is practically and substantially in line with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and his Policy Board in 1890, who conceived a most magnificent naval establishment for this country to cost \$300,000,000. As will be remembered, of this vast sum for naval increase one hundred and sixty-six millions was to be devoted to the creation of a fleet of battle ships, three of which ships were appropriated for in the naval bill of 1890—and one more has found its way into this bill. The so-called battle ships—were to be thirty-five in number of three different classes ranging from 6,000 tons to 10,000 tons displacement, and in the naval bill of 1890 the Secretary of the Navy asked that the construction of eight of said ships be begun at once. These battle ships of the first class are to cost from five to six millions of dollars, and it is not expected that the first one ordered will be ready for service under five years.

These battle ships have a forced speed of about 15 knots an hour, and are not fast enough to overtake the modern commercial ship, which makes at least 20 knots an hour; and they are also quite as useless for harbor defense as they are for commerce destroyers. In case of war these battle ships would lie lazily upon the water in full view of the modern speedy commercial ship and unable to overtake her. As a harbor-defense vessel the battle ship you propose to build will be weak and insignificant in comparison with the modern Ericsson monitor, whose achievements revolutionized the naval policies of the world during our late civil war, and which my amendment requires the Secretary to first build before another dollar is appropriated for battle ships. It was during the discussion of the naval bill in 1890 that we were first informed of the particular part these battle ships were to play in the naval policy of the Government.

It was not denied that for commerce destroyers or harbor defense they were not suitable; but it was urged in their behalf that these ships could carry the American flag into the enemy's ports, or far from our shores could meet an invading fleet and there settle the question of naval supremacy upon the high seas. The committee and the Senate were there reminded that in any naval battle between the United States and other more formidable naval powers the chances of victory would lie with those having the most and best ships and the heaviest guns; and if de-

feated 1,000 miles from our coast we were without land defenses or floating batteries or any interior line of defense whatever, and the deep humiliation would be ours of seeing our coast commerce destroyed and our seaport cities bombarded, sacked, or burned.

Moreover, the people of this Republic have no sympathy with any ambition which aspires to seek trouble with other nations far from home; but they do demand protection at home against invasion by an enemy's fleet. The cry has gone up long and loud from the entire seacoast for more adequate protection, and the response it found is more battle ships and more cruisers. We have now built and under way—all of which will be put in commission before 1894—twenty-three cruising ships of all classes, enough at least to protect what American commerce there now is, or to make severe reprisal upon an enemy's commerce. Certainly with this showing we can afford to stop building cruisers for a year or two, until we can secure some part at least of that protection which our defenseless seacoast demands.

These proposed battle ships might be very serviceable to Great Britain or other powers having large colonial possessions far from their shores, to which men, material, and munitions of war must be transported. The ship to them must serve two purposes, as a seagoing transport ship, and a battle ship combined. We have no colonies; we seek none. We have no alliances which are likely to provoke a foreign war, and no expectation of such an event happening. Instead of hastening to make preparation for such a catastrophe, we should and would do all we could to avoid it. The countries to the south of us have all become sister republics. A continent of republics. We are separated by 3,000 miles of angry waters from any formidable naval power and whose people we are now engaged in supplying with food products they can not get elsewhere. This we hope to continue to do, but building battle ships will not help us to continue this work.

The Navy Department seems to have fallen into the same errors that have made ridiculous the naval policies of other countries, and has adopted the type of an inferior ship as the type of vessel we should build. It rejects the American type of fighting ship as found in the improved monitor, a type of ship whose performances startled the entire world, and accepts instead the broadside ironclad ship of England. You require that all naval ships shall be built in American shipyards, of American material, by American labor, and yet you reject the American ship, the product of American genius and skill, the ship best adapted to American needs. You go to England for models of construction, which, while they may serve England's ends, are entirely unsuited to our own.

If we are to have no war, we need no ships; if war must come, the thing more needing protection is our unprotected coast line from Maine to Galveston and along the Pacific, which brings to us an admonition and points unerringly to the fact that longer delay on the part of Congress to provide adequate defense approaches criminality.

For cruising ships not heavily armed or armored, and which are kept continually at sea, provision should be made for comfortable and roomy quarters for officers and men, but in vessels designed for coast and harbor defense, and which need never leave port except for practice or to fight an enemy, everything else should be sacrificed that will tend to secure for the ship the highest degree of military efficiency.

Capt. Ericsson being neither a commodore nor a constructor in the Navy, and therefore without prejudice against ships which have neither cabins, bath, or toilet rooms, having regard for the safety of the officers and men in battle rather than for their comfort while cruising, conceived a ship for war, a battle ship, which in its general type never has been improved upon and never can be.

This is the character of ship my amendment proposes to build, to stop building for a time battle ships and cruising ships, and instead appropriate for a number of these floating fortresses provided with the most powerful battery and the heaviest of armor. Such a ship may be made invulnerable to shot and shell. The low freeboard of the monitor gives her greater stability than the high freeboard battle ship requiring for protection that she carry an iron mine upon her ribs.

The low free-board monitor gives a much less quantity of space to be armored, makes her lighter, and increases her adaptability in an engagement with the enemy, while, compared with the broadside battle ship, the chances of her being injured by the enemy's shot is as one to fifty, and it is still further reduced when we take in consideration the shape of the turrets, which will deflect any projectile not striking nearly in the center. In short, for all the uses of a ship for war the combination of forces make this type of ship practically irresistible.

And for sea service, as well with the same power and speed granted to ships of other types, it has been demonstrated her safety and supremacy there could not be disputed. Nautical science teaches the fact that submerged bodies are but little af-

fected by the violence of a gale or a heavy sea. The frail raft drifts unharmed with the sea, while the top-hammer, the iron-bound masts of a large ship, are torn to splinters. The testimony of officers highest in rank and ability who experimented with these ships during the late civil war gives to this type of ship seagoing qualities of the highest order—that they would outlive any storm or dare any sea—and yet the monitors then in use were weak and insignificant as pepper-boxes when compared with the proposed modern monitor.

Chief Engineer Stimers, United States Navy, in his report to the Secretary of the Navy describing the battle in Charleston Harbor, says:

That it has been established to the satisfaction of the intelligent and unprejudiced men that the capacity of the monitors to resist unharmed the most terrible fire from guns and rifles of the heaviest calibre has never been overstated. From 50 to 100 guns of heavier calibre than was ever before employed against ships of war were brought to bear upon the monitors in the harbor and without serious results.

The Patapsco, it is said, was struck fifteen times upon her turret in a single day, and, withdrawing for some slight repairs, returned to the engagement on the following day.

Admiral John Rodgers, one of the most distinguished officers of the American Navy—having been caught in a hurricane off the coast while in command of one of the monitors during the late war—speaking of the storm, says that—

The waves were over 30 feet in height, and during the heaviest of the gale I stood upon the turret and admired the behavior of the vessel. She rose and fell to the waves, and I concluded that the monitor form had great seagoing qualities. If leaks were prevented no hurricane could injure her.

The same authority, speaking of the military efficiency of the monitor type of ship, says:

When the monitor class measures its strength against the Ironsides class, then with vessels of equal size the monitor class will overpower the Ironsides class, and indeed a single monitor will capture many casemated vessels of no greater individual size and speed.

This is the report of some of the most distinguished officers of the American Navy in respect of the efficiency of the monitor type of battle ship, and when it is remembered that it applied to small ships with wooden platforms, capable of steaming only 6 or 8 miles per hour, and armored with only a few inches of iron upon her single turret, the report speaks volumes.

I now ask the chairman of the Naval Committee when in all the world's history has the modern English broadside, iron or steel clad monster you propose in your bill to copy, ever been in a naval engagement, or demonstrated its power and potency as an efficient ship for war? All this is still a matter of opinion where opinions differ, and not one of fact.

Capt. Paul Jones met the Serapis on equal terms, both sailing wooden ships of equal size, both heavily armed and manned, and this naval duel upon the high seas decided nothing except the greater courage and skill of the American sailor. The conditions have not changed. The English, the French, the Germans, build ships suited to their colonial demands, and we simply copy them. You meet the enemy to-day upon the same relative terms that Capt. Jones met the Serapis, ship for ship, gun for gun, and man for man. The merest accident in an engagement between these iron monsters 1,000 miles from shore might turn the victory from us, and without reserve lines of defense, and we have none, the deep humiliation of seeing our cities bombarded, our harbors blockaded, and our domestic commerce destroyed, will still be ours.

The cost of a single battle ship will build two or three of the harbor-defense vessels named in my amendment. The cost of maintaining a battle ship in commission will not be less than \$1,500,000 per annum, while these coast-defense vessels need never be in commission except to leave her moorings for practice, or to meet an invading enemy. The question my amendment presents is simply this, will you continue to build the un-American battle ships which we do not need, or will you confine this appropriation to the American coast-defense vessels which we do need?

I commend to the attention of the Senate the able and exhaustive speech made by the distinguished Senator from Oregon when this subject was under discussion on May 23, 1890. That Senator had made a careful computation of the cost of keeping these ships in commission for a term of years, and the result of his computation, always careful and correct in his statements, is indeed frightful. I read from page 5179 of the RECORD, from the speech of the Senator from Oregon:

For convenience I will make the estimate as to one ship and then multiply it by three:

Cost of ship without armament and exclusive of premiums for increased speed	\$4,000,000.00
Cost of armament, equipment, etc., when the vessel is ready for commission	1,000,000.00
Interest for 2½ years on cost during construction at 3 per cent. I estimate that it will take five years to build one of these ships, and that the interest should be computed for one-half the period on the full sum, and the amount is	375,000.00

The cost at the time of commission, then, would be..... 5,375,000.00

Interest on cost for twenty-two years, at 3 per cent per annum	3,558,500.00
Interest on each annual payment of interest on the first cost until the ship is out of commission at the end of twenty-two years	1,117,452.50
Amount of annual repairs, estimated at 3 per cent annually on cost for twenty-two years	3,558,500.00
Interest upon each annual payment for repairs from the end of the year when paid until expiration of the term of the life of the ship	1,117,452.50
Pay rolls, supplies, etc., estimated at \$250,000 per annum, an amount in my judgment entirely inadequate, for twenty-two years	5,500,000.00
Interest on annual expenditures for pay roll and supplies, at 3 per cent	1,932,500.00
Total cost of one vessel for twenty-two years' service	22,159,405.00
Cost of three vessels	66,478,215.00

This is more than one-half the amount estimated by the Board of Fortifications and Other Defenses for the permanent defense of twenty-seven of our principal ports, and at the end of twenty-two years, if we keep up the Navy, the same expenditure would have to be commenced again, and the expenditure of the same amount incurred for the next twenty-two years.

Before this bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs and after the naval establishment bill had been reported by the Senator from Maine for the construction of eight great battle ships, I made a similar estimate as to the cost of those ships. I reckoned the interest, however, at 5 per cent per annum. The Government may be able to obtain money at 3 per cent, but it is worth 5 per cent to the people who have it to pay.

That estimate is as follows:
The first cost of eight war ships provided for by the bill would be \$45,120,000
Add interest upon this amount for two years of the time the vessels are being constructed, estimating that period at five years and computing interest at 5 per cent per annum 4,510,000

Total cost	49,630,000
That is the first cost.	
Estimating the probable life of the vessels at twenty-two years, simple interest on their cost at 5 per cent would be	54,585,200
Simple interest on each year's interest on cost would amount for the twenty-two years	28,662,480
Average cost of repairs which I have said should be estimated at 3 per cent, according to British authorities, for the whole twenty-two years would be	32,756,126
Simple interest upon the cost of each year's repairs until the end of the period of twenty-two years would be	28,662,480
Cost of supplying and running, including coal, ammunition, pay of officers and men, dockage, wharfage, etc., I have estimated at \$2,500,000 annually (an amount entirely too low, I am satisfied). The total amount for the twenty-two years would be	55,000,000
For the twenty-two years' simple interest on yearly cost of supplying and running the vessels would be	29,925,000

And the total cost of the eight war ships for twenty-two years' service, when they would have to be put out of commission and new ones constructed, would be 279,226,280

My curiosity led me to make a calculation as to the probable cost of the great Navy proposed by the Policy Board for twenty-two years upon this basis, and estimating that the smaller vessels would last twenty-two years as well as the great war ships, which is not the case, because the annual percentage of deterioration is much greater on a small vessel than on a large one, it is easily done by the rule of three. If eight vessels, the construction of which costs \$45,120,000 in the first instance, without counting interest upon the cost during the construction, cost for twenty-two years' service \$279,226,000, what would be the cost for the same time of the Navy estimated by the Policy Board, to cost in the first instance \$349,515,000? This gives a grand total of over \$2,000,000,000, as the cost of such a navy upon the basis which I have figured it, and which I think is the only correct one.

It is for these reasons that I am opposed to the construction of the vessels provided for in this bill and am in favor of the construction of coast defenses, and it is for these reasons I have proposed the amendment which has been read for the purpose of substituting them for these vessels reported by the Policy Board, and which are neither seagoing vessels nor coast-defense vessels, which possess just speed enough to make it certain they will always be in the wrong place when they are wanted, and which can neither run away from an enemy nor run down a merchant ship, and for all practical purposes are worthless. The three floating batteries were recommended by the Board on Fortifications and Other Defenses.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I am a good deal interested in the questions which have been raised by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON] and discussed by him, and I think the American people will be a good deal interested in them.

I think we may take one thing as settled, whatever we may think, whatever our individual opinions in regard to the policy of creating an American Navy of modern build and equipped in modern fashion, that public opinion has settled down pretty much to recognize the necessity of a prudent and wise expenditure of money upon the Navy of the United States and creating a naval force on modern principles and constructed in modern fashion that will give us a standing among the naval powers of the world and give us a self-reliance as a commercial power which it is impossible we should have without such an armament.

So whatever may be said—and I think a great deal may be said—about the impolicy of arming a Republic like ours and situated as ours is and keeping it in a constant state of preparation for war, so far as the naval arm of the military service of the United States is concerned, I think the people demand of us a wise and prudent expenditure of money in building up a respectable navy of the United States.

That being so—and I assume that in all I shall say—the question of how that shall be done is the question which we must decide. We maintain at great expense and wisely (if we are to maintain a naval force at all) a body of trained, educated, and experienced officers, who devote their lives and are enabled by the liberality of the American people to devote their lives to the study of naval

architecture and to the great problems which have been raised throughout the world among the naval powers as to the proper construction of naval vessels for offense and defense. That being so, I think the people of the United States are wise enough and have enough common sense to take the opinion of the experts whom they pay and set apart for the purpose of studying this question, and do not believe that the best course can be adopted or decided upon in town meeting.

When the Senator from New Jersey says that the people of the United States are demanding one class of vessels rather than another, I say, with due respect to him, they are demanding no such thing. They are demanding that the naval experts, who are paid out of the Treasury of the people, shall decide this question for them, because the American people have not lost their business sense and that saving common sense of which I spoke, which enables them to employ the best talent and spend their money on the wisest advice and counsel.

How absurd to throw into the field of debate in this House or the other the question whether the monitor type of coast vessels, or the modified battle ship, or the cruiser is the best policy upon which to build up the American Navy! On the other hand, I believe, and I think I am able to state and challenge successful contradiction, that the naval experts of the United States, those men who have devoted their lives to the study of these questions, who have become cognizant of the best experience of the world in naval matters, have discarded the monitor type either for offense or defense.

This very Policy Board, wisely selected by the Secretary of the Navy, and which made its report two or three years ago, to which the Senator from New Jersey has alluded, has gone over this whole subject and made a recommendation to the Congress of the United States which meets with the approval of officers of the Navy almost universally. I know there are one or two officers who have suggested that the monitor type is the best possible type, but their opinions in this matter are eccentric so far as the general opinion of the Navy is concerned. They have not found acceptance for their views in naval circles and among men who have no other interest in the world than to decide upon and recommend the best possible type of vessel for the American Navy.

Now, what are the objections to this very type of vessels the Senator from New Jersey has so lauded? They are stated in the report of the Policy Board to which he has alluded, consisting of some of the very best officers of the Navy, men in the prime of life, selected for their accomplishments and ability, and the result of whose study has been accepted in naval circles everywhere in this country. I read from page 11 of that report. They say:

Three classes of these battle ships of limited endurance are recommended; all having the same general characteristics of speed and maneuvering power, in order that they might act together as a unit, or in squadrons to the greatest possible advantage. This is a consideration which the Board deems of the utmost importance, as it would give such a fleet an advantage over any fleet now in existence. At the same time the diminished draft of water of the smaller vessels permits them to enter ports along our Southern coast, which the larger vessels could not enter. The main object of all these battle ships is the protection of our own coast.

Precisely the object which the Senator from New Jersey says his amendment has been framed to forward.

The Board deems it unnecessary to further indicate in this report the disposition to be made of these vessels to accomplish this object. In considering the general type—

Now, this is the important point, so far as the question with which I am now concerned goes—

In considering the general type of these vessels, the Board has naturally investigated carefully the merits and demerits of the essentially American monitor type. As a result it finds that this type of vessel is only adapted to smooth-water service and that the conditions of its efficient working are therefore at variance with a large part of the duty demanded. As it is believed that a very wide misconception exists on this subject both within and without the Navy, the leading features of the investigation are given in the Appendix B.

I wish to read a paragraph or two from that appendix, where they discuss the monitor type. This Board was in existence, I think, two years. They had every facility that the Navy Department could give them to pursue their investigations, and I have no doubt that they diligently and faithfully availed themselves of all the advantages that were thus thrown in their way. Speaking of the monitor they say:

Opposed to the fire of guns overmatching her armor, the monitor can stand very little punishment. In a sea way she has not speed enough to force a combat with any intact ship. But the great and cardinal defect of the monitor type, in anything but smooth water, remains to be stated, as consisting in the utter lack of steadiness accompanying the great stiffness required for stability, and the consequent impossibility of doing any work with the guns.

Although I am not a naval expert and have already said that I think this is a question to be decided by the best opinion of naval authority, yet I think that this opinion commends itself to the common sense of the people and certainly will commend itself to the common sense of Senators who are giving any attention

to this proposition. The monitor type of vessel mounts its guns in a turret in which the axis of the gun is not quite 5 feet above the flotation of the vessel, and the lower segment of the gun is sometimes in smooth water more than 3 feet from the surface of the water. That being so, it must be manifest even to nonseafaring men that the moment the vessel is taken into a seaway there is the utter absence of a suitable platform for a gun. The muzzle of the gun comes within a few inches if it does not entirely dip into the water, and it is only for a second or two when she is rising upon the wave in the process of her rolling that they can procure the necessary altitude for efficient firing.

The battle ship is a modified monitor. It has not abandoned the good features of the monitor type. It is based upon the cardinal features of Mr. Ericsson's great invention. It has the revolving turret which is the essential feature of the monitor; but the gun of that form is from 18 to 22 feet above the surface of the water; the oscillation of the ship is in a wider arc and occupies two or three times as long as the roll of the monitor, which, being nearly submerged, follows the inclination of the wave itself and makes an oscillation in the ordinary sea wave in about eight seconds, whereas it takes something like twenty seconds for the roll of the free-board battle ship, the high free-board monitor, as it might be called. I am only repeating in my own way what these gentlemen say in a more scientific and accurate way.

All ships have great stiffness in the direction of their length and therefore closely follow the effective wave slope in pitching, this slope being, however, very much reduced by the considerable length of most ships as compared with that of all ordinary waves. On account of the great transverse stability of the monitor type, the same conditions obtain in their rolling as in all pitching, except that the beam and draft being small, the effective wave slope is very much steeper. These vessels in rolling, then, closely follow the wave slope, and in such a ship in the trough of waves having a period of eight seconds and a maximum slope of 10 degrees—very ordinary values—guns trained on the broadside would point at intervals of four seconds from 10 degrees above the horizon to 19 degrees below it. Ordinary vessels roll through larger angles, albeit in a greater time, but they undergo periods of comparative quiet, when a gun can be laid with some degree of accuracy.

The monitor's artillery suffers the additional disadvantage of being so close to the water that it is only well up a fair-sized wave that another vessel can be seen, while the swash of water over the decks seriously interferes with the working of common turrets, although it will be observed that from so closely following the water surface much better weather is made than would at first be expected from the extreme lowness of free board.

Now, further on:

That the same measure of defense can be obtained—

To show that these gentlemen have carefully studied the question raised by the Senator from New Jersey in the light of their experience and education and general ability to discuss such subjects, I cite this opinion:

That the same measure of defense can be obtained by very numerous and powerful sea-going fleets off the coast supplemented by monitor and shore defenses of the principal harbors, as with the vessels proposed by the Board, is unquestionable, but we are of opinion that greater security with far greater economy can be obtained by the type of battle ships of limited endurance, capable not only of affording local defense to the harbors, but of rapid mobilization and concentration under all circumstances and of acting with perfect confidence on the high seas.

In the opinion of the Board, the six vessels of the monitor type already provided for afford a sufficient proportion of purely harbor-defense vessels.

Then the question would seem to be, as stated by these gentlemen, between a type of vessel that was only able to operate in the smooth waters of our harbors and must invite the enemy's ship within destroying distance of all our great seacoast in order to engage them at all, and the other type of vessel which has all the advantages of harbor defense in that they engage the enemy outside the harbor at any distance which may be deemed convenient or safe or for strategic purpose necessary, and with far greater efficiency in the line of management and use of the artillery with which they are armed.

These recommendations are made by the men who expect to fight these battles in case of war. They are made by the men who take their lives in their hands and are to stand upon these decks in that great day of battle at sea, and they are entitled to the consideration that this circumstance will give.

Mr. President, it is very important that we should not make any mistakes now in building up this Navy, which it seems that public opinion demands of the American Congress, and that while we proceed slowly, without attempting to rival any of the great naval armaments of England, or France, or any of the great maritime powers, we should be able to avail ourselves of the experience of all of them, to avoid their mistakes, to improve where they have made a success, and to give to the American people the best possible work for the expenditure of the money that they with great public spirit and patriotism are ready to grant for this purpose.

Now let me read, before I take my seat, a letter from just one of the men in the Navy who is of the age and of the class that will make his opinion especially valuable—I mean men of the rank and age who are now at their maximum of activity and of development as naval officers, those of the commander list. I may as well give the name of the writer of this letter. It is

Commander P. F. Harrington, who has no interest in this question other than to see the best possible type of ship adopted for the increase of the American Navy. Whether there shall be one ship or more is a question for us to decide on economic reasons, but in whatever advance we make I think it must be apparent that we must consult as to the type and character of vessel those who are best calculated to give a good judgment in that respect. He says:

OFFICE OF UNITED STATES LIGHT-HOUSE INSPECTOR.

FOURTH DISTRICT.

(Post-Office Building, Room 30, fourth floor),

Philadelphia, Pa., May 12, 1892.

DEAR SENATOR: Without going into a full statement at present, and referring to my letter on the monitor of low freeboard, written to you two or three years ago, I will summarize the objections to that type of vessel as follows:

1. The metacentric height of low-freeboard monitors is much greater than in the high-free-board monitor. The Miantonomoh is a representative of the former, and the Indiana of the latter.

The low-free-board monitor has, in consequence of extreme metacentric height, a very quick period of rolling. The vessel is very stiff; that is, she has a strong tendency to return to the upright position when thrown out of it by waves, and she is deficient in steadiness. She is not a good gun platform in a sea way, and it is doubtful that accurate practice with the guns can be obtained while the vessel is in a moderate sea.

The high-free-board monitor, like the Indiana, has the steadiness which is characteristic of vessels of moderate metacentric height. Her guns can be fought in any weather.

2. Steaming in a sea way, and particularly against it, the low-free-board monitor will have great difficulty in using her guns at all, because of the very low position of the guns. In the Miantonomoh the axis of the guns is only 4 to 5 feet above water.

That would bring the lower segment of the gun much closer to the water.

It is doubtful if that vessel can fight in a moderate gale. The same objection applies in a less degree to the low-free-board monitor where the guns are mounted *en barbette*, as in the Puritan.

3. The low-free-board monitors are well known to steer badly except at full speed. The reason is well known, but need not be stated here. The Miantonomoh, for example, at low speed, is hardly under the control of her helm. This is a serious defect, which would place her at a disadvantage in possible phases of an action requiring her to move for a time at a reduced speed.

4. The low-free-board monitor is deficient in speed, which gives to a hostile fast high-free-board monitor the power to choose all the incidents of position. The latter, for example, may ram: the former can not.

5. The low-free-board vessel has a very limited sphere of action, the high free-board a very wide range, including that of the former.

6. The single advantage of the low-free-board monitor is in the presentation of a small target to hostile guns. This advantage is less than formerly, since the armored deck has now given great protection to the buoyancy and stability of the high-free-board vessel.

7. The elevated position of guns in a high-free-board monitor is now regarded as giving advantage by way of plunging fire.

8. The first characteristic of monitors, the turret, has been universally adopted. The second, low free board, has been rejected by all naval powers but our own.

The low-free-board monitor of our Navy has never been successfully tried at sea firing her guns during a gale and in a sea way. Why can not it be done before we are fully committed to that line of construction? The captain of the Baltimore reported recently that her guns could be worked in any gale. Ought any less facility of action to be accepted in a powerful battle ship or in any vessel designed to encounter a battle ship?

I believe that one Indiana is worth two Puritans or three Miantonomohs.

That is of the type which the Senator from New Jersey so lauded as the best possible type to be adopted in the American Navy.

I believe that the construction of low-free-board monitors for our Navy, if persisted in, must perpetuate our naval inferiority. We can have but few battle ships, and each new one should be superior to all others in existence, which can not be said of the low-free-board monitor.

Sincerely yours,

P. F. HARRINGTON.

Hon. GEORGE GRAY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 1282) exempting American coastwise sailing vessels piloted by their licensed masters or by a United States pilot from the obligation to pay State pilots for services not rendered.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside, and the Senate will proceed with the consideration of the pending bill. The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Delaware will proceed.

Mr. GRAY. I read this letter from this gentleman, who is a friend of mine, not because he is a friend of mine, but because he stands in the Navy as one of the best authorities in regard to all naval matters that the Navy has in it, a man universally respected for his accomplishments as a seaman and as an officer; and I read it not only on that account, but because I believe that he represents nearly all the officers of his class in the Navy; I mean those gentlemen who are between the rank of ensign and admiral, between the younger grades and the grades that are about to be retired, grades which must necessarily do the fighting if we are presently to have war, men at the greatest period of activity, physically and intellectually. These men are all

earnest, they are all emphatic in their indorsement of the recommendation of this Policy Board, and they are all equally emphatic in their condemnation of a policy that would put us into what Capt. Harrington calls a position of naval inferiority by the adoption of such a policy as that recommended by the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, after these citations of opinion from those whom the Government of the United States has put in place in order that it may act wisely in these matters, it is not hard to understand that it would be the height of impolicy to spend millions of dollars in creating a class of vessels that can never go to sea or expect to fight at sea. If we are to protect our harbors, why not spend the people's money upon a class of vessels that are equally good, as these officers say, for harbor defense, and can also go outside of the harbors, and on the high seas engage any vessel that an enemy can bring against us. When a vessel gets into harbor, the only place in which a monitor can efficiently perform its duty, then the danger line is there close to our American cities. When a battle ship of an enemy sails into New York Harbor and finds there waiting, as she must wait, one of this monitor class to engage her, she already has the city of New York under her guns, and the time is a little late, and the place a little unfortunate, to decide the destinies of this country in a naval combat; whereas the vessels that are recommended by the committee and by this Policy Board will defend the coast better by meeting the enemy miles outside of the harbor and engaging them there, and illustrate the prowess of American seamen and the merits of American ships.

Though not on the committee now, I was on the committee when this question was discussed before it, and for that reason I make no apology for expressing the convictions that are very sincere and very emphatic on this subject in opposition to the proposition of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I shall support with pleasure the motion of the Senator from New Jersey to increase the harbor-defense ships from one to three. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that one of these ships is already in the bill as it has been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, and the proposition of the Senator from New Jersey is merely to increase the number from one to three.

The proposition of the Committee on Appropriations is to construct "one harbor-defense double-turret ship of the monitor type, with a displacement of about 7,500 tons, to have the highest practicable speed for vessels of its class, and to cost, exclusive of armament and of any premiums that may be paid for increased speed, not exceeding \$3,000,000." So that, as the Senator from Delaware has not objected to the number of the ships, but rather to the type, I take it for granted that if he is opposed to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey he is in favor of defeating the proposition of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GRAY. Let me say to the Senator from New Hampshire that in the few words I said I was discussing the general question raised by the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey in regard to the adoption by the Government of one type or the other of these vessels. I was aware that one such vessel had been recommended in the amendment of the Naval Committee. I am no less opposed to that. I think that would be an unnecessary expenditure of money, and I should be opposed to it even if only one vessel more were to be built instead of three.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand the Senator to be opposed to the proposition of the Committee on Appropriations to build one of these harbor-defense ships of the monitor type. That is the proposition which the Senator from New Jersey has moved to amend.

I also call the attention of the Senator from Delaware to the fact that the Policy Board, from which he has quoted so freely, in its scheme for building a navy to cost in all \$349,515,000 includes six harbor-defense monitors at a cost of \$25,000,000. So it is apparent that the question which has been raised by the Senator from Delaware is a technical one which Congress does not propose in any event to decide.

At any rate I do not propose myself to enter into the discussion which has arisen between the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Delaware concerning the comparative merits of monitors and high free board ships, because, as I say, it is a technical one, and it is to be presumed that the Secretary of the Navy will not build any useless ships. If Congress should make a gross mistake in an appropriation and furnish money for a useless or a dangerous ship the Secretary would refrain from building it until another session. The Senator from Delaware himself says that in the various classes of battleships which are recommended by the Policy Board and by the Secretary of the Navy there are preserved all the useful features of the monitor type of ship. So I do not very well see that there is a question

here for discussion at any great length or any ground for an animated contest. We do not propose to decide technical questions.

Mr. GRAY. If the Senator will allow me, the contest is precisely between the high and low free board, between the low-gun platform and the high-gun platform; that is all. That is radical.

Mr. CHANDLER. Do I understand the Senator to have reached the conclusion that he does not wish any low free board harbor-defense ships, that all the ships that are constructed, whether designed primarily for seagoing ships or for coast-defense ships, ought to be ships of high free board?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not prepared to go as far as the Senator from Delaware. I do not think that the authorities which he has cited justify the conclusion that we want no ships for harbor defense with low free board. I am willing to leave the technicalities of that question to the Navy Department. I do not believe that under the amendment which has been reported by the Senator from Maine from the Committee on Appropriations for one harbor-defense double-turreted ship of the monitor type there is any danger of the construction of a vessel which will be useless, nor any danger of an unwise expenditure of the public money if we increase the number from one to three.

The Senator from Delaware will admit that it is desirable to have in a ship of war as low a free board as possible. It certainly can not be an advantage in a ship that it exposes a large bulk to the shot of the enemy. The Senator does not say that it is an advantage.

Mr. GRAY. Not an advantage, if the Senator will allow me, but the gentlemen who composed this Board say that the disadvantage of a larger target is largely done away with by the modern armor-protected deck that these vessels have.

Mr. CHANDLER. Still I think that the officers of whom the Senator speaks would not think it undesirable in a battle ship or in a naval vessel of any kind to expose as little as possible of the hull of the ship to the enemy. It certainly can not be an advantage to expose the hull. It certainly is an advantage to avoid exposure, as far as possible.

Far be it from me to say that there is an animosity to ships of the monitor type among naval officers because they are not convenient ships on which to live. I would not be willing to attribute to the officers of the Navy any feeling of that sort, and yet it is a fact that the ships of the monitor type with low free board, where the officers and men have to live below the water line, are notoriously uncomfortable ships, and there is a certain prejudice against them on that account. But none the less should they be built. We are not constructing ships, certainly not constructing our harbor-defense ships as convenient homes either for the men or for the officers of the Navy, although we have no objection in building ships that are adapted for the national protection to have them as comfortable as they can be made.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator has just said, if he will pardon me, that he did not for one moment attribute to the officers of the Navy any such bias on that account in the opinion they have given.

Mr. CHANDLER. I will say that I have heard it attributed to them. I do not say that I make any such charge against them.

Mr. GRAY. Then the Senator ought not to make the other remark.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am not certain about that. I usually know what I am saying. The Senator will notice that I said there had arisen a prejudice against these ships on this account; but I am bound to believe the present officers of the Navy have risen above it in reaching their conclusions as to what should be the ships of the future navy, and that those who oppose vessels of the monitor type are not governed by considerations of that kind.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, believing that ships constructed under the appropriation will be useful ships and capable of doing good service, because I think that we should do all that we possibly can in the direction of harbor defense. The Policy Board, as I have said, recommends six such ships at a cost of \$25,000,000.

Mr. GRAY. But the Senator will recall the fact that the recommendation goes along with a scheme for a navy extending over a great many years and creating a larger number of ships and expending a far larger sum of money than the Congress will ever consent to expend.

Mr. CHANDLER. Admitting what the Senator states, that these ships should form only a part of extensive naval construction, I am in favor at this time and at all times of constructing the harbor-defense vessels as soon as Congress can be brought to make appropriations for that purpose. If anything is to take precedence now I think harbor-defense vessels should have the first chance. I am not saying that we have done unwisely so

far, but I do say that we have now reached a point where we should on every occasion make appropriations for harbor-defense vessels, and should proceed to strengthen the floating and the fixed defenses of the exposed harbors of the country.

I call attention to the Fortifications Board's report which was made January 16, 1886, House Executive Document No. 49, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, which Senators will remember recommends appropriations extending over fourteen years of \$126,377,800 in all, and of that amount more than \$26,000,000 are for floating harbor defenses, namely, for floating batteries and their armament, for San Francisco \$10,725,000, for New Orleans \$8,150,000; for submarine mines and their adjuncts \$4,334,000, and for torpedo boats \$9,720,000, making, as I said, more than \$26,000,000 for floating harbor defenses.

Mr. GRAY. That was for floating batteries. The Senator from New Hampshire is speaking now of appropriations recommended for floating batteries and torpedo boats.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is not a low-turreted monitor with high-power guns on it a floating battery?

Mr. GRAY. Not by any means, in the sense in which the term is there used.

Mr. CHANDLER. There the Senator again approaches technical questions with which I do not profess myself to be competent to deal. I believe that the report of the Fortifications Board contemplated, if appropriations were made to carry out their recommendations, the construction of vessels of the monitor type as a portion of these floating harbor defenses; and I do not think that Congress can do an act which will meet with greater popular approval, now that the battle ships and the large cruisers are well under way and many of them completed, than to provide liberally for the construction of formidable harbor-defense ships.

The Senator from Delaware says—I forget his exact language, that he is not influenced or would not be influenced by what would be called a popular demand for vessels of a particular class.

Mr. GRAY. No, I did not say that. I said that there was no popular demand for vessels of a particular class; that I thought the popular demand was that the experts of the Navy should give us the best possible results of their study and experience.

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not wish to do any injustice to the Senator, but I believe that there is a popular demand for suitable harbor defense, and that the public mind would be gratified and popular apprehensions relieved by a more elaborate system of such defense. Therefore I think that we should not only appropriate for harbor-defense vessels of the monitor type and for harbor-defense vessels to be floating batteries, but that we should also appropriate liberally for fixed harbor fortifications upon land.

Mr. ALLEN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire permit an interruption?

Mr. CHANDLER. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN. In view of the idea being advanced by the Senator from New Hampshire I wish to call his attention and that of the Senate to the fact that every city along Puget Sound has been urging most strenuously that the character of coast defenses he speaks of may be adopted. The northwestern waters especially demonstrate the necessity and propriety of defense of this character. Our attention has been called directly to the need of such protection in our late threatened international troubles. The entrance to Puget Sound is 2½ miles wide. Its waters are very deep. The tide runs so strong in and out that torpedoes can not be used to advantage. A population of 200,000, with more than \$100,000,000 of property are within easy cannon range of the shores of Puget Sound. It seems to me that just the character of defenses the Senator from New Hampshire is urging are imperatively demanded for the defense of that region. That is the popular judgment and has the sanction of high naval and military authority, and it has been the demand of that region pressed upon Congress by memorials and petitions from every community along those exposed shores. A memorial of the Commercial Club of the city of Tacoma sets forth the need of such harbor defenses in a clear and forcible manner.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no doubt that such a feeling prevails along all our seacoast and at all our exposed harbors, and that nothing would gratify the people of the country more than an increase in the number of what might be suitable harbor-defense ships.

In considering the question of the increase of the Navy which is proposed by the original House bill, by the amendment of the committee, and by the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey, it may not be a waste of time to examine the progress which has been made in naval construction during the last ten years.

The war of the rebellion was mainly fought by the navy on both

sides in wooden ships and with smoothbore guns, and the opinion of the world was that such ships and guns were the appropriate naval weapons. The people of the United States were in favor of wooden ships, because in such ships our naval heroes had achieved magnificent victories and had made the United States renowned upon the ocean. This continued to be the prevalent idea when the war closed in 1865. To be sure we had reached the important development of the monitor type of ship.

The contest between the first little Monitor and the Merrimac at Hampton Roads had become famous throughout the world, and the success of this armored ship against the Merrimac, an improvised armored ship, had caused the construction by the United States of a large number of single-turreted monitors and a considerable number of double-turreted monitors, and about the time they were completed and ready to do battle the war came to an end. It came to an end without a realization on the part of the people of the United States that the day of wooden ships had been numbered. We still believed that with the exception of low-freeboard monitors, with turrets and smoothbore guns, the naval battles of the future would continue to be fought in wooden ships and with smoothbore cannon.

It took us nearly fifteen years to comprehend what a revolution had taken place in naval construction, and to find out that we must discard wooden ships and smoothbore guns, and, if we intended to be a great naval and maritime power, must begin the construction of a different class of ships and a different class of guns. For that period we struggled along, repairing the old wooden ships, handling our old smoothbore guns, and maintaining a vicious navy-yard system which had very little to justify it and was obnoxious in many of its manifestations to severe condemnation.

But in 1881 it was realized that it was time for the United States to begin the construction of a different kind of navy. The nations of the world, which begun to construct vessels of the monitor type in consequence of the battle of the Monitor and the Merrimac and of the experience of this nation, had also begun to construct battle ships of steel, and there came further the invention of the high-power built-up rifled cannon. So a little more than ten years ago the people of the United States, through their public officials, brought themselves face to face with the necessity of a new navy and of new ships composed of iron or steel, with the modern rifled cannon.

I desire to read from the message of President Arthur in 1881. On December 6, 1881, he said to Congress:

I can not too strongly urge upon you my conviction that every consideration of national safety, economy, and honor imperatively demands a thorough rehabilitation of our Navy.

The Secretary of the Navy, Hon. William H. Hunt, on the 28th day of November, 1881, in his report to the President, had opened an eloquent and elaborate argument in favor of the rehabilitation of the Navy with this sentence:

The condition of the Navy imperatively demands the prompt and earnest attention of Congress. Unless some action be had in its behalf it must soon dwindle into insignificance. From such a state it would be difficult to revive it into efficiency without dangerous delay and enormous expense. Emergencies may at any moment arise which would render its aid indispensable to the protection of the lives and property of our citizens abroad and at home, and even to our existence as a nation.

I date the genesis of our new Navy with the recommendations of President Arthur and Secretary Hunt in 1881, and the views there expressed found concrete form subsequently to that period in what may be termed the Navy-reform act of August 5, 1882.

On the 5th of August, 1882, a bill became a law which may be considered the beginning of a new era in American naval affairs. (1) There were on the Navy Register too many officers, and provision was made for their gradual diminution, by the process of omitting to fill vacancies, until there should be a reduction of 140 staff and 115 line officers, leaving the reduced number of 1,562 in all, and (2) it was enacted that thereafter no more graduates of the Naval Academy should be taken into the service than should be necessary to fill vacancies which might happen.

I take occasion here to say that the reforms contained in the act of August 5, 1882, were largely due to the presence in the House of Representatives of Hon. George M. Robeson, who had lately been the Secretary of the Navy, and that this particular clause providing that no more graduates of the Naval Academy should be taken into the service than should be necessary to fill vacancies which might happen originated, if I am not mistaken, with the Senator from New Jersey whose amendment I am now discussing.

3. The appropriations for the cumbrous civil establishment at the navy-yards and stations were reduced, and the Secretary was directed, if the work could not be carried on for the amounts appropriated, to make no deficiency, but to suspend work at some of the yards. 4. It was deemed indispensable to the construction of a new steel navy that the lives of the old wooden ships should not be prolonged by perpetual repairs, and it was therefore en-

acted that no wooden ship should be repaired where the estimated cost, either as to the hulls or engines, would exceed 30 per cent of their estimated value.

I ask the Senator from Maine to give me his attention. I have read the clause in the act of 1882 which provided that there should be no repairs of wooden ships where the cost would exceed 30 per cent of their estimated value. A clause of a similar character has been contained in every naval appropriation act since that date, and I wish the Senator to state what the percentage is in the present bill now before the Senate?

Mr. HALE. The Senator will find the provision under the head of "Bureau of Construction," on page 25:

That no part of this sum shall be applied to the repairs of any wooden ship when the estimated cost of such repairs, to be appraised by a competent board of naval officers, shall exceed 10 per cent of the estimated cost, appraised in like manner, of a new ship of the same size and like material.

I will say to the Senator that it naturally follows that as the wooden ships become less valuable it is less and less an object to repair them. That accounts for the provision being as I have read it.

Mr. CHANDLER. So that every naval appropriation act, as I understand the Senator, since the one of August 5, 1882, has contained a limitation, beginning with 30 per cent and going down to 25 per cent, and at last to 10 per cent.

Mr. HALE. And resulting from that is the practical disappearance from the American Navy of the wooden ships.

Mr. CHANDLER. Therefore the date of the final disappearance from the Navy Register of all the wooden ships may be reckoned with accuracy. Indeed, the committee and the other House have found it necessary to except from the provisions of the 10 per cent limit two ships named in the present bill, the Hartford and the Kearsarge, which they think ought to be retained longer on account of their historic memory, the Hartford having been so long the flag ship of the gallant Admiral Farragut, and the Kearsarge having achieved the honor of the destruction of the Alabama.

The construction of a new navy not only originated with President Arthur and Secretary Hunt, but it proceeded in a general way upon the lines laid down by an advisory board organized by Secretary Hunt on the 29th day of June, 1881. That board consisted of Rear-Admiral John Rodgers, Commodore William G. Temple, Capt. P. C. Johnson, Capt. K. R. Breeze, Commander H. L. Howison, Commander R. D. Evans, Commander A. S. Crowninshield, Lieut. M. R. S. MacKenzie, Lieut. Ed. W. Very, Chief Engineer B. F. Isherwood, Chief Engineer C. H. Loring, Passed Assistant C. H. Manning, Naval Constructor John Lenthall, Naval Constructor Theodore D. Wilson, and Naval Constructor Philip Hichborn. Capt. K. R. Breeze being disabled by ill health his orders as a member of the Advisory Board were revoked, and Lieut. Frederick Collins, on July 8, 1881, was detailed to supply the vacancy.

This Board made a report on the 7th of November, 1881. It contains a full and elaborate discussion of the conditions of naval construction at that time, and one conclusion was that it was not advisable to commence immediately to build any armored ships. Therefore they confined themselves to cruisers, and I will ask the Secretary to read the summary of the recommendations of the Board.

The Secretary read as follows:

SUMMARY OF THE NUMBER, CLASS, TYPE, AND COST OF THE VESSELS THAT THE BOARD RECOMMEND NOW BE BUILT.

Two first-rate steel, double-decked, unarmored cruisers, having a displacement of about 5,873 tons, an average sea speed of 15 knots, and a battery of four 8-inch and twenty-one 6-inch guns. Cost, \$3,500,000.

Six first-rate steel, double-decked, unarmored cruisers, having a displacement of about 4,560 tons, an average sea speed of 14 knots, and a battery of four 8-inch and fifteen 6-inch guns. Cost, \$3,532,000.

Ten second-rate steel, single-decked, unarmored cruisers, having a displacement of about 3,043 tons, an average sea speed of 13 knots, and a battery of twelve 6-inch guns. Cost, \$9,300,000.

Twenty fourth-rate wooden cruisers, having a displacement of about 793 tons, an average sea speed of 10 knots, and a battery of one 6-inch and two 60-pounders. Cost, \$4,360,000.

Five steel rams of about 2,000 tons displacement, and an average sea speed of 13 knots. Cost, \$2,500,000.

Five torpedo gunboats of about 450 tons displacement, a maximum sea speed of not less than 13 knots, and one heavy-powered rifled gun. Cost, \$725,000.

Ten cruising torpedo-boats, about 100 feet long, and having a maximum speed of not less than 21 knots per hour. Cost, \$380,000.

Ten harbor torpedo-boats, about 70 feet long, and having a maximum speed of not less than 17 knots per hour. Cost, \$250,000.

Total cost of vessels recommended now to be built, \$29,607,000.

Mr. CHANDLER. It will be noticed that while this Naval Advisory Board recommended that the larger vessels should be built of steel they had not entirely overcome the opinion that wooden ships would still play a part in the navies of the world and they recommended twenty new wooden cruisers. In pursuance of the policy of the Administration, including the recommendations of the Advisory Board, the act of August 5, 1882 authorized the construction of two steam cruising vessels of war, at a total cost, when fully completed, not to exceed the amount estimated by the late

Naval Advisory Board for such vessels, the same to be constructed of steel, of domestic manufacture, having as near as might be a tensile strength of not less than 60,000 pounds to the square inch, and a ductility in 8 inches of not less than 25 per cent, said vessels to be provided with full sail power and full steam power.

Here we find for the first time in the construction of vessels of any sort in the United States the adoption of homogeneous iron or mild steel of great tensile strength and of great ductility, which the Naval Advisory Board and Congress came to the conclusion would be the most useful material for the construction of the hulls of naval vessels. No construction was begun under the act of August 5, 1882, of the largest steel cruiser, because it was found it could not be built within the limits of cost imposed by the act; but in the act of March 3, 1883, there was an additional authorization of two steel cruisers of not more than 3,000 ner less than 2,500 tons displacement each, and one dispatch boat, as recommended by the Naval Advisory Board in its report of December 30, 1882. There had been created by the act of August 5, 1882, a new Naval Advisory Board to assist the Secretary of the Navy in constructing war vessels and their armament.

This being the Congressional authority for the construction of a new navy, the Administration carried out with promptness the directions which had been given. Its work has been concisely stated thus:

A new naval policy was adopted prescribing a reduction in the number of officers, the elimination of drunkards, great strictness and impartiality in discipline, the discontinuance of extensive repairs of old wooden ships, the diminution of navy-yard expenses, and the beginning of the construction of a new navy of modern steel ships and guns according to the plans of a skillful Naval Advisory Board. The first of such vessels, the cruisers Chicago, Boston, and Atlanta and the dispatch boat Dolphin, with their armaments, were designed in this country and built in American workshops.

There was another act of Congress which has operated powerfully in promoting the construction of modern high-power guns for the use of the United States. That was the act of March 3, 1883, which provided for a gun foundry board.

This Gun Foundry Board, consisting of Army and Navy officers, appointed under the act of the 3d of March, 1883, visited Europe and made full reports advising large contracts for terms of years with American manufacturers to produce the steel necessary for heavy cannon, and recommending the establishment of one army and one navy gun factory for the fabrication of modern ordnance.

Seeing before me the chairman of the Military Committee of the Senate, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], it is proper that I should say that this act which provided for a gun foundry board was, I think, preceded by an elaborate investigation made by the Senate Committee on Coast Defenses, of which the Senator from Connecticut was chairman, and also by a full inquiry by a committee of the House of Representatives of which the late Representative Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania, was chairman.

Mr. HAWLEY. The gentleman will allow me to make the statement historically correct. There was a select committee on ordnance and warships appointed by the Senate of which I had the honor to be chairman. It went over many of the leading establishments in this country and in England by a subcommittee and made a report of considerable length.

Mr. CHANDLER. In July, 1883, contracts were made for the construction of the above four ships with John Roach, who was the lowest bidder of the only three iron-ship builders of the United States, who all made proposals for the work. The construction progressed rapidly, and on the 4th of March, 1885, when the Administration of Mr. Cleveland came into power, the Dolphin was completed and ready for her trial trip, the Boston and Atlanta were nine-tenths completed, and the Chicago was eight-tenths completed.

All these ships were subsequently finished and placed in commission, and have been ever since in active service. It is not my purpose to say anything now of a partisan character, and therefore I pass over much that is historical in connection with the ships, and content myself with saying that they were, considering the state of the art of constructing of marine engines at that time, as good ships as could be found in the world. There were in the navies of the world no ships of the same types which were any better than they were at the time when they were constructed.

Since that date great progress has been made in the designs of compound steam engines for ships, and all new ships are built with engines superior to those to be found upon the Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, and Dolphin; but the ships themselves, irrespective of the engines, which were the best that then were made, have abundantly vindicated the designers and have become a credit and an honor to the builder, who has passed to his account.

I have here a volume entitled "The Development of Navies

During the Last Half Century," by Capt. S. Eardley Wilmot, of the Royal Navy, published in 1892, and I read from page 273 his opinion of the first vessels of the new American Navy:

In the meantime no new ironclads had been built, and when in 1880 the country was ripe for a considerable augmentation of the fleet, the first want was seen to be that of efficient cruisers. As it was determined not to go abroad for ships and guns, considerable delay was inevitable, so it was not till 1883 that four modern cruisers were commenced, the Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, and Dolphin. The first named is the largest, 4,500 tons, with a speed of 15 knots, and a mixed armament of four 8-inch, eight 6-inch, and two 5-inch, besides smaller guns. The 8-inch guns are mounted two on a side in sponsons. I think a lighter and more homogeneous armament would have been better, but the Chicago is undeniably a very powerful vessel. The Atlanta and Boston are similar in design, but smaller, while the Dolphin is a dispatch vessel of 1,500 tons. All have been completed, and proved successful, a matter highly creditable to all concerned.

I make this quotation, not because English opinion is better than American opinion, but because this English opinion has undoubtedly the merit of being impartial.

Mr. President, it is not my intention to trace the progress of the rehabilitation of the Navy from 1883 to 1892. But I desire to call the attention of the Senate and to make of record a comparison of our Navy at the time that new construction commenced with its present condition. I first read from the report of the Navy Department of the 29th of November, 1882:

The available cruising war vessels of the Navy are—one first-rate, the Tennessee, of 4,840 tons displacement; 14 second-rates, the Trenton, Lancaster, Brooklyn, Pensacola, Richmond, Hartford, Alaska, Omaha, Lackawanna, Ticonderoga, Vandalia, Monongahela, Shenandoah, and Powhatan, varying in displacement from 2,100 to 4,000 tons; and 22 third-rates, the Juniata, Ossipee, Quinnebaug, Swatara, Galena, Marion, Mohican, Iroquois, Wachusett, Wyoming, Tuscarora, Kearsarge, Adams, Alliance, Essex, Enterprise, Nipsic, Yantic, Ashuelot, Monocacy, Alert, and Ranger, varying in displacement from 900 to 1,900 tons; making in all 37.

The last four, of less than 1,400 tons displacement, have iron hulls; all the others are built of wood.

These vessels are creditable in their appearance, commodious in their quarters for officers and seamen, well adapted for ordinary naval exercises, and useful for displaying the national flag upon the seas and in the harbors of the commercial world. But they are of low speed; their engines are not modern, only fourteen being compound; and their steaming, maneuvering, and destructive powers are inferior to those of the present war ships of other navies. It is not the policy of the United States Government to maintain a large navy, but its reputation, honor, and prosperity require that such naval vessels as it possesses should be the best which human ingenuity can devise and modern artificers can construct. Our present vessels are not such, and can not be made such. They should be gradually replaced by new iron or steel cruisers, and allowed to go out of commission.

The naval appropriation act of August 5, 1882, provides that no repairs shall be made "of any wooden ship where the estimated cost of such repairs shall exceed 30 per cent of the estimated cost of a new ship of the same size and like material." This wise provision should be adhered to in future appropriations, and the limitation of repairs fixed at 20 per cent or less. The present wooden ships should receive only such moderate repairs as will enable them to serve the purposes of the Government until a new modern navy shall, without undue haste and with due economy, be constructed, which will fitly represent the power and protect the interests and honor of the nation.

ARMORED VESSELS.

The available armored vessels are: Thirteen fourth-rates, the single-turreted monitors Ajax, Canonicus, Camanche, Catskill, Jason, Lehigh, Mahopac, Manhattan, Montauk, Nahant, Nantucket, Passaic, and Wyandotte, varying in displacement from 1,800 to 2,100 tons.

These monitors were built in 1862 and 1863; have no speed; carry each two large smooth-bore guns of small power and short range; and have been mostly laid up, since their use in the late war. As they are our only vessels for harbor defense they have not yet been broken up, and during the past summer three have been repaired, placed in commission, and put in motion—the Montauk in the Delaware River, the Nantucket in the Hudson River, and the Passaic at and near Hampton Roads, with indifferent results.

The report then considers the subject of guns, and states as follows:

ORDNANCE.

The guns of the Navy are: 2,233 smooth-bore muzzle-loading cannon of various calibers; 77 Parrott muzzle-loading 40-pound rifles; 267 similar 40-pound rifles; 51 muzzle-loading 180-pound converted rifles; 26 breech-loading 40-pound converted rifles, and 10 breech-loading 80-pound converted rifles.

The eighty-seven converted rifles have fair power, and may be considered useful for the present. The Parrott rifles were made during and immediately after the rebellion; they might in an emergency serve a subordinate purpose as part of our armament, but are in no real sense suited to the needs of the present day. The smooth-bore guns are incapable of contending with rifled guns throwing one-half their weight of shot.

With not one modern high-powered cannon in the Navy, and with only 87 guns worth retaining, the importance of action for the procurement of naval ordnance seems apparent if the Navy is to longer survive.

That was the condition in 1882. What is the condition in 1892? I have prepared a statement of the new vessels of the modern Navy, omitting everything except the iron and steel vessels which have been constructed since the act of 1882, or are to be constructed if the present bill becomes a law. Assuming that all the old Navy goes out of existence, that we complete the vessels already authorized, and adopt the provisions of the present bill, including the ships proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, this table will show the condition of the Navy under those circumstances.

VESSLS OF THE NEW NAVY IN COMMISSION, BUILDING, AND AUTHORIZED

CLASS 1.—Double-turreted harbor-defense vessels.		Number.
Vessels	7
Guns	44
Officers	95
Seamen	1,075

Puritan, Miantonomoh, Amphitrite, Monadnock, Terror, Monterey, and vessel authorized by the appropriation bill for the year 1893.

CLASS 2.—Armored cruisers.

	Number.
Vessels	3
Guns	46
Officers	60
Seamen	1,198
Marines	116

Maine, New York, and vessel of New York type under the bill for 1893.

CLASS 3.—Rams.

	Number.
Vessels	1
Officers	8
Seamen	84

No. 1, harbor-defense ram.

CLASS 4.—Armored battle ships.

	Number.
Vessels	5
Guns	72
Officers	108
Seamen	1,768
Marines	180

Texas, Massachusetts, Indiana, Oregon, and the vessel authorized by the bill for 1893.

CLASS 5.—Protected cruisers.

	Number.
Vessels	13
Guns	136
Officers	266
Seamen	3,786
Marines	450

Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, Newark, Charleston, Baltimore, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Cruiser No. 6, Cincinnati, Raleigh, and cruisers 12 and 13.

CLASS 6.—Cruisers.

	Number.
Vessels	3
Guns	30
Officers	48
Seamen	651
Marines	75

Cruisers 9, 10, and 11.

CLASS 7.—Gunboats.

	Number.
Vessels	10
Guns	70
Officers	119
Seamen	1,371
Marines	124

Yorktown, Concord, Bennington, Petrel, No. 5, No. 6, and the four vessels authorized by the bill for 1893.

CLASS 8.—Special class.

	Number.
Vessels	5
Guns	6
Officers	36
Seamen	440
Marines	6

Dolphin, Bancroft, Vesuvius, dynamite cruiser No. 2, torpedo cruiser.

CLASS 9.—Torpedo boats.

	Number.
Vessels	9
Officers	25
Seamen	165
Marines	6

Stiletto, Cushing, torpedo boat No. 2, and the 6 torpedo boats authorized by the bill for 1893.

TOTAL.

	Number.
Vessels	56
Guns	404
Officers	765
Seamen	10,538
Marines	957

These figures are only approximate.

I call the attention of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] to the number of vessels in the present Navy, or in the Navy as it will be if the present bill passes, for I see he is giving and has been giving for the last half hour close attention to what I have been saying.

Now, Mr. President, take this number of heavy guns, 404, which will be the complement when all the ships are ready. Two hundred and sixty-nine are already completed, and, therefore, 135 yet remain to be built. The seamen required for the 56 ships will be 10,538; the present number of seamen authorized by law is 8,188; leaving an increase to be made of only 2,350.

It is interesting to notice the number of officers to be required for this new Navy of fifty-six vessels as compared with the number of officers required in the old Navy. The number required for the new Navy is 765; while we now have 1,316, leaving a surplus of 551 officers. That is to say, assuming that all the ships will be in commission all the time—which will never be the case—there will be required 765 officers, while we have actually in the Navy at this time 1,316; so that we shall have 551 officers for shore duty and for a surplus force. It can easily be seen, therefore, why the Secretary of the Navy says that after the transfer of the Revenue Marine to the naval service and after the present 220 officers of the Revenue Marine have disappeared through lapse of time, there will still be enough officers of the Navy to continue to do the legitimate work of the Navy and also to handle the vessels of the Revenue Marine.

Mr. President, it thus appears that the United States, which had comparatively no navy ten years ago, will have with t

present constructions and those to be authorized, a navy of ships and modern guns which will compare favorably with an equal number of the ships and guns owned by any of the great naval powers of the world.

The question now before the Senate is, what more shall we do? What shall be our future constructions? Shall we largely increase this number? Or shall we rest with and not increase it? I believe, Mr. President, that we should go on with naval construction; that we should not rest where we are; and that, without undue haste and with wise economy, we should every year construct a certain number of new ships and manufacture a certain number of new and modern guns. I believe that harbor-defense vessels should take precedence in construction now of all other vessels. Therefore, as I have said, I support the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, I was obliged two years ago to dissent from a report of the Naval Committee in favor of the construction at that time of eight heavily-armed, thickly-armored, ocean-going, line of battle ships which were to cost not less than \$45,120,000, or \$5,640,000 each. These eight ships were the first ships recommended by the so-called Policy Board in their report favoring the construction of a navy to cost \$349,515,000. I did not believe at that time that we ought to commit ourselves to the construction of eight of those large line-of-battle ships, and I stated the reasons which influenced me to arrive at that conclusion.

I was willing then to vote for the construction of two such ships, and those have been authorized, and an additional ship has been authorized, and it is proposed to authorize one more at present. That will make four of these heavy battle ships of about 10,000 tons. Mr. President, I believe that at least those four should be constructed and that authority should be given for the construction of this additional one at the present time.

These ships, Mr. President, are vessels of the right size for this country to construct. We can not with wisdom build battle ships any larger than 10,000 tons for one reason, because many of our harbors do not admit vessels of a much deeper draft of water than 25 feet, and if there were no other reasons that would be a sufficient reason for not constructing at this time any of the enormous battle ships such as have been built by some of the European powers.

Mr. HIGGINS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire undertake to say that there are not on the Pacific coast harbors of greater depth of water than that?

Mr. CHANDLER. I do not mean to be understood as saying that we have no harbors in which vessels drawing more than 25 feet of water can enter, but that so many of our harbors do not admit ships of more than 25 feet draft that the construction of these battle ships would be unwise.

Mr. HIGGINS. I would like to call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the question whether or not the harbors of San Francisco and Portland Oregon, as well as the Columbia River and that great estuary, Puget Sound, and the various harbors on our Pacific coast, are not among the deepest harbors in the world?

Mr. CHANDLER. Some of them are, I think.

Mr. HIGGINS. And therefore that that entire coast stands distinctly as an exception to the rule which the Senator has just laid down; and if that is the case I should suppose that the Senator would confine his remarks to the Atlantic coast.

Mr. CHANDLER. Now that the Senator from Delaware is a defender of the Pacific coast, I will withdraw my suggestion and say that I think that vessels drawing more than twenty-five feet of water might well enough be constructed for the Pacific coast.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator from New Hampshire allow me to make another correction?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. HAWLEY. Purely by accident this morning I was conversing with a man who is perhaps the best capable of any man in Washington to give me the information, and he told me that he knew that they would be able to obtain 30 feet of water in the New York Harbor under the improved Gedney channel.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I am glad to learn that we are succeeding in deepening our channel entrances.

My principal reason for concluding that we ought not to build battle ships of more than 10,000 tons is because, as I am about to show, the general European opinion is now in favor of battle ships of about that size.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator will allow me to make another correction, for if I do not make it I shall hear from home. About 30 feet of water can be taken in the New London Harbor, Connecticut.

Mr. CHANDLER. I have no doubt that is so; and I am reminded that a vessel of any draft of water can go into the harbor of Portsmouth, N. H. But I suppose the Senators from Connecticut and Delaware know that there are many harbors in this

country into which a naval vessel drawing more than 25 feet of water can not go.

Mr. President, Capt. S. Eardley Wilmot, in his book on the Development of the Navies, from which I have already read, speaks of the latest constructions of the British Government, and I wish to call attention to their close resemblance to the battleships which are being built in this country. On page 145 he says:

But under the naval-defense act two so-called battleships of the second, class are being constructed, to be named Centurion and Barfleur. The length to which we have gone in adding to the size of all classes is strikingly illustrated in this pair. Their displacement is to be no less than 10,000 tons—

He then speaks of the armament, and says that he is disposed to say that we should never exceed a maximum thickness of 12 or 14 inches. He then proceeds:

In the Centurion and Barfleur we have a type which will, I believe, be highly commended by naval officers. All the attributes necessary for an efficient fighting ship are present, and the instrument is in due proportion to the human faculty which has to wield it. There must be a point at which this ratio is disturbed. Mechanical science, pushed on by the exertions and talents of a few, may outstrip the capacity of ordinary intelligence, and what is successful experimentally, when no disturbing element comes into play, may fail under the more searching conditions of war. We, in common with all nations, appear to have gone too far in the production of monster ships and guns, and I trust the reaction that must always follow such excesses will lead to a great increase in the numbers of what, for the moment, we term second-class battle ships.

Now, I come to page 277, where he speaks of the American ships which have a striking resemblance in their general features to the Centurion and the Barfleur of the English navy:

Towards the close of 1889 it was decided to construct three larger vessels termed coast-line battle ships. Presumably the name was given to calm any suspicion that the country was about to embark on an active foreign policy, but it is quite obvious that a vessel which can only operate in sight of land has but a limited use. These vessels, the Indiana, Massachusetts, and Oregon, will, however, be quite capable of proceeding to any part of the world should the honor of the country demand this service. They are to have a displacement of 10,300 tons, and will be 350 feet long and 69 feet broad.

He criticises the ammunition as being of too many kinds, and suggests that about four different calibers would answer all requirements. Then, on page 278, he says:

But to return to the American ships. In all other respects the design seems excellent, and in keeping within 10,500 tons the temptation to build monster vessels has been avoided. The view of the Naval Department at Washington is that "the lack of important naval battles in recent years stands in marked contrast to the desperate efforts of European powers to equip extraordinary vessels designed to combine the invulnerable and the irresistible. A war of moderate duration between first-class naval powers would prove that a balance of advantages, unsuspected by many, rests with that vessel which has comparative simplicity, even though it be concomitant with a greater exposure of life, a lower speed, and reduced powers of offense." This seems to me admirably put, but I think the argument for simplicity applies also to the armament.

Two of these battle ships are to be built by Messrs. Cramp, of Philadelphia, and the third at the Union Iron Works, San Francisco. At both yards cruisers have been completed, in which the workmanship has proved to be excellent.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am brought to the conclusion that it is wise to build the additional battle ship provided for in the bill that is now before the Senate, and that with these four battle ships we shall have exactly what the country needs.

Mr. President, I wish to say before concluding what I think should be the Navy of America. I do not think that we should undertake to build a navy equal to that of the great European powers. I do not think that any Senator, or any public man in America, or any naval officer advocates any such enlargement of the Navy. I have stated in the report to which I have alluded how far I think we should go in the direction of naval construction.

Coast defense should be first amply provided for. All the arts of naval warfare should be kept alive among our people. Industries necessary to the construction of any kind of war vessels or guns should be domesticated. We should restore the flag of our merchant ships and revive the carrying trade in American vessels in all the waters and in all the commercial ports of the globe, and protect our mercantile marine when thus reestablished. We should construct and maintain a Navy superior to that of any nation of the western hemisphere, and to that of the nation owning the island of Cuba; and there we can stop, it is to be hoped, for many years.

Mr. President, it is hardly to be supposed that the United States will ever become engaged in a war with any one of the great European powers without having at the same time an alliance of some sort with some one of the other great European powers. We certainly can not undertake to build a navy that shall be superior to that of all the great European naval powers. If all those powers should combine against us of course they would be irresistible, and it would be impossible for us to undertake to meet them upon the ocean with the vessels of our Navy.

But such a combination is impossible. Whenever we find ourselves approaching a conflict upon the ocean or upon the land with England or any other of the great powers of Europe we shall find ourselves approaching an alliance with some one or

more of the other great European powers, and when the shock of battle comes we shall have to oppose against our European enemy not only our own Navy but also the navy of some European ally. It is not conceivable that we shall have a conflict with any of the European powers under any other conditions. Therefore it is that I have reached my conclusion that when the Navy of this country is the equal of that of any power upon the western hemisphere, is equal or superior to the navy of the nation which owns the island of Cuba, we can afford to rest. We are sure to have a navy with fifty-six modern ships completed and armed which will not be inordinately expensive, either in the cost of construction or in the cost of maintenance, and which can be depended upon, as it seems to me, to maintain the interests and the honor of the United States under all imaginable circumstances.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, I do not want to occupy any more of the time of the Senate, except to say a single word in reply to the honorable Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY]. I think that Senator has fallen into the error of believing that this is a correct policy, solely upon the statement of a naval officer who I think has reached only the grade of commander in the Navy. Everything stated by—I think it was Commander Harrison—is absolutely disputed by naval officers of much higher rank, who have been in command of these monitor ships during the war. I could give the testimony to the contrary of Admiral John Rodgers, Admiral Porter, Capt. Stimers, and several other distinguished officers. I have statement after statement here, which I will not take the trouble to read, denying *in toto* everything that the Senator from Delaware has said in vindication of his position. I hold in my hand a document in support of the monitor type of ship, written by Capt. Brice, one of the most distinguished officers of the Navy, who takes the high and bold ground, verified as it is by all past experience, that the best sea ships in the world are the monitors; that the best fighting ships in the world are monitors; that they can go anywhere that a battle ship can go; and that we are better able to protect them by armor than to protect a broadside ship. They are better for harbor defense than any other type of ship.

When we first began the increase of the Navy it was under the administration of Mr. Chandler, Secretary of the Navy under President Arthur's Administration, and now Senator from New Hampshire. We provided for a naval increase which consisted of what? Of a number of cruising ships and the completion of the incomplete monitors. Mr. Whitney pursued the same policy, and he provided for the construction of a few cruising ships and a few harbor-defense ships. It has remained for this administration of the Navy to make a departure from the long, unbroken practice in the Department and ask for the construction of battle ships.

I am sorry that the present diligent, able administrator of the Navy Department has fallen into the error of accepting and taking without question the decision of a board of inexperienced naval officers as to a naval policy for this country which is to cost hundreds of millions of dollars, equivalent almost to bankrupting the country.

The policy I propose is twofold: Protect your harbors and construct cruising ships in sufficient numbers to carry the flag on the ocean and about the seas, whether it be at the tropics or the poles. Let that satisfy the hungry pride of our naval officers, if you please, and fit them out with all the appliances that can give them comfort and convenience while on shipboard. But when we undertake to defend our ports, let us build a war ship, a fighting ship, a ship for war, a ship to resist an invader; and sacrifice all else to secure this end. Let us do it all at a cost of a hundred million dollars, instead of at a cost of several hundred million dollars, as this wasteful Naval Policy Board recommends. That is all there is in my contention.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I think the conclusion of the Senate must be that the Committee on Appropriations has found a fair and reasonable line of policy to be pursued in this amendment. It does not suit everybody. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] would add to the number of vessels and increase the number of monitor ships. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] has advised a diminished number. Between these two extremes I think Senators will perceive that the committee has made a fair and reasonable basis, going upon the advice, as suggested by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], that the country is committed to an increase of the Navy and believes in it.

The programme adopted by the Committee on Appropriations only provides for a moderate increase in order to keep the work of building up the Navy going on, not extravagantly, but only in a reasonable way. I think instead of one battle ship there ought to be two. The Secretary of the Navy recommends two. Last year we appropriated for none, and by reason of that lapse we ought to appropriate for two this year. But the Committee on

Appropriations, bearing in mind such suggestions as have been made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] relative to the condition of the finances, did not think it well to go so far, and only provided for one.

In deference to that sentiment, which I agree with the Senator from Delaware, is increasing in the Navy, the committee still desires the experiment to be tried of a harbor-defense ship of the monitor pattern, and puts on one ship of that kind. That does not content the Senator from New Jersey, however, and yet, if he will allow me, I think it would be better for him to accept that as a demonstration of his idea, and trust to the future for the rest. Beyond that the committee has only put on what the Secretary asks for, the light-draft gun boats, which are needed in the waters of South America and in the Asiatic waters, and six torpedo boats—a very moderate appropriation, looking to the condition of the Treasury, the finances of the country. It has increased the appropriation for the next fiscal year only \$500,000 for this purpose.

With that moderate proposition, upon which the Committee of Appropriations, with perhaps a single exception was unanimous, I think the country will be content, the Treasury will not be raided, and there will be no deficiency made in it, and we shall still go on with what has been settled as the policy of the country, the building up of a navy. I hope the Senate will take this view of the matter.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think the Senator from Maine will not be willing to misrepresent the position I occupy in regard to this matter. I think he does not exactly understand it. I have stated that it was my intention to move to strike out of the naval bill all the appropriations that the committee had recommended for an increase of the Navy for larger ships, and in order that I may not be misunderstood I will now change my amendment to strike out and insert.

I move, Mr. President, on page 39, line 22, after the word "contract," to strike out all that follows, down to line 8, on page 41, after the word "dollars," thus striking out your cruising ship and your battle ship, so that my amendment will read as follows:

That for the purpose of further increasing the Naval Establishment of the United States, the President is hereby authorized to have constructed by contract three harbor-defense double-turret ships, etc.

Mr. HALE. I am entirely willing to have a vote of the Senate upon that.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Let the vote be taken, because if adopted it will show the purpose of the Senate to take the amount of money appropriated by the bill and apply it to ships that we do need, and not to ships that we do not need. I would like to have the sense of the Senate on that question.

Mr. HALE. Unless some other Senator desires to debate the question, I am entirely willing that a vote of the Senate shall be taken now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASCO in the chair). Will the Senator from New Jersey be kind enough to send up to the desk his amendment?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I will state the amendment. It is on page 39, line 22, to strike from and after the word "contract," in said line, down to and including the word "dollars," on page 41, line 8.

Mr. HALE. That strikes out the armored cruiser put in by the House and the battle ship provided by the Senate.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Precisely.

Mr. HALE. And substitutes for that the three monitor ships that the Senator desires?

Mr. MCPHERSON. In lieu of one monitor ship I provide for three. It will be a settlement, I think, at least the beginning of a settlement, of this vexed question whether we shall bankrupt this Government by continuing the battle-ship policy, or whether we shall simply provide for national defense along our seacoast; and as we are likely to secure from the merchant marine faster than we can use them a full supply of cruising ships, we can postpone for the present all thought of cruisers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON] will be read.

Mr. HALE. There is no necessity to read the part proposed to be stricken out.

The CHIEF CLERK. The amendment proposes to strike out all after the word "contract," in line 22, page 39, down to and including the word "designate," on page 41, line 2, and disagree to that part of the committee's amendment beginning with: "Also one seagoing coast-line battle ship," in line 3, page 41, and ending with the word "dollars," in line 8 on the same page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, since I have had the honor of occupying a seat upon this floor I have uniformly voted for fair appropriations for the new Navy; as the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] has stated, this wise and patriotic work

began during President Arthur's Administration; during President Cleveland's Administration it was pushed with vigor, skill, and superb administrative ability, and has continued during President Harrison's Administration up to this time.

Ever since the Administration of Mr. Cleveland, which began in 1885, there has been great unanimity of opinion on all sides as to the necessity for such appropriations. During his Administration, while the Senate was Republican, and other questions excited and divided us sharply on political lines, yet the naval appropriation bill was never considered a partisan measure. That Administration had the hearty support of nearly every Republican in this body for appropriations that were advised and thought necessary. And so it has been during the Administration of President Harrison.

We appropriated in the Forty-seventh Congress, during President Arthur's Administration, \$2,300,000 for the new Navy; during the Forty-eighth Congress, President Arthur's Administration, \$4,045,000. Mr. Cleveland was President during the Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Congresses. In the Forty-ninth Congress there was appropriated \$14,785,360; the Fiftieth Congress appropriated \$12,990,000, making the total appropriations during his Administration for the new Navy \$27,775,360. During the last Congress, President Harrison's Administration, there was appropriated \$25,727,000; making altogether \$59,847,360 appropriated during the Administrations of Presidents Arthur, Cleveland, and Harrison.

Under the provisions of those various acts, Mr. President, we have created plants which are a marvel to the whole world. It does not apply alone to the Navy. We are equipping and have ready now the finest war vessels, of their type, that float upon the ocean. We have done more than that. We have created plants that are constructing vessels for commercial purposes. These shipbuilders claim, and I believe it to be true, that they are now prepared to construct the finest steel vessels on private account within 10 per cent of the cost of like ships constructed on the Clyde. We have in the State which I have the honor in part to represent three or four shipyards constructing vessels for the Government and for commercial use. The largest plant in Maryland, and probably one of the best equipped in the country, is at Steelton, Baltimore Harbor, the president of which informed me a few days since that while they were prepared to construct the largest war ships, they had not and probably would not make an offer to construct a war ship, for the reason that his company had reached the point where they would have all that they could do on private account.

The concurrent testimony is to the effect that but for the appropriations, heretofore made on account of the Navy, none of these great plants would have been equipped with machinery to build war ships, or the great ships for commercial use that are now afloat and being constructed.

Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate, making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1893, comes here from the House of Representatives. It is a bill framed by a distinguished member of that body [Mr. HERBERT], with the approval and support of a committee, and of the House itself. It is, in my judgment, the most perfect bill, considered as a whole, that has reached the Senate; certainly during the time I have had the honor of serving as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill, as it comes here, recognizes the importance of continuing the increase of the Navy. The House which passed it says to the country, "We can not afford to arrest or retard this work." But they only provided for the construction of one new ship, an armored cruiser of about 8,000 tons displacement, to cost not more than \$3,500,000.

Mr. President, the anxious desire of the framers of this bill to reduce the expenditures of the Government I understand and am in full sympathy with, if it can be done without detriment to the public service. But, Mr. President, it is no new thing for the Senate to amend appropriation bills. It is the combined wisdom of the Senate and House of Representatives which has made possible the results in shipbuilding to which I have alluded. The Committee on Appropriations of this body, after a careful and thorough investigation, reached the conclusion that the bill as it came from the House was not broad enough to accomplish the result that the framers of the bill intended, and hence the amendment now under consideration, making provision for the construction of additional vessels.

Mr. President, as one member of the committee, after hearing the statements of the Secretary of the Navy and other officers, with all the data that could be had, I was forced to the conclusion that if we limited the construction to one ship, as provided for in this bill as it came from the House, we should be in great danger of paralyzing these industries that have done so much to build up the Navy and to build merchant vessels.

Hence, I have been prepared now under this Administration to

vote for an increase of the Navy about in the proportion that was willingly accorded by the majority of this body to an Administration with which I was in accord and sympathy. The increase authorized by the Senate committee is about \$11,000,000 in the aggregate. I think that is the amount. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] will correct me if I am wrong. That was the amount to be expended, running over a period of years. Probably the greater proportion of it will not be drawn from the Treasury until 1894 or 1895. So that the annual expenditures of the Navy for the next fiscal year and the following will not be largely increased by the proposition as reported from the Committee on Appropriations. It will, however, enable the great factories and forges to go on and complete their machinery, extend their plants, and be prepared to do better work, at prices less than those we have been heretofore paying.

Now, Mr. President, I think it is due that I should say that from the time of the induction of Mr. Whitney into the office of Secretary of the Navy until this moment, with all this liberality on the part of Congress, there has never been the breath of suspicion as to the economical and wise expenditure of every dollar of money which we have placed under the control of these two Administrations. We have dealt with the Navy Department, and particularly with the present Secretary of the Navy, in a way that ordinarily would be considered dangerous and unwise. We have placed in his hands millions of dollars to be expended, as a portion of it has been expended, without a contract.

Secretary Whitney contracted with the Bethlehem and other works for the steel armor of these vessels. The difficulty of manufacture was greater than was considered probable at the time when the contract was made; the machinery was not in existence; the skill was not in the country; they failed to comply with the provisions as to the time of delivery. But the work of the construction of the vessels could not be delayed without great danger and jeopardy and without increase of cost.

The present Secretary of the Navy, authorized, as I think he was under the law, contracted without advertising with another great firm in Pennsylvania for thousands of tons of armor, and amidst all the political discussions we have had and the natural desire of partisans to criticize their opponents, there has been no man who knew the facts who was not ready to testify that the Secretary did a wise act in the interest of the Government and assumed a responsibility which required courage. The result has been one of benefit to the Government.

Now, sir, I know, as has been suggested here to-day on both sides of the Chamber, by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] and by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], that the financial problem is a serious one. We have been criticised in the public press and elsewhere for the great amount of money which is being expended. I think it can be demonstrated that our expenditures exceed the revenues. I think we have reached the point where the appropriations will exceed by \$20,000,000 or \$25,000,000 all the money that is to come into the Treasury during this fiscal year and the next from all sources.

The expenditure of \$500,000,000 per annum, Mr. President, is an immense amount of money, and yet that is within the amount which is to be appropriated by this Congress. These expenditures have grown from year to year, and economy and careful appropriation must be the order of the day from now henceforward, or an increase of taxation must follow. These expenditures have grown steadily; probably most of them have grown necessarily. The great amount which is to be paid on account of pensions has been swollen beyond the intention of any man in Congress. It is there; it is fixed. I know of no way by which it can be decreased now. The same is true of other expenditures which have gone on increasing from year to year as the business of the country increases. I know, Mr. President, however, of no great item which can be reduced by this Congress.

I know there have been great expectations of a possible decrease in appropriations of fifty or one hundred million dollars. My colleague, and the senior Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. COCKRELL], shortly after the adjournment of the last Congress, published a statement in the public press showing that the laws which had already been enacted had fixed the expenditures for this year at about \$480,000,000, without regard to the deficiencies which were to come and which have come. So, when the country is startled with the proposition that we now are to appropriate \$500,000,000, the answer, and the perfect answer, is, that the laws which have been heretofore passed make that an absolute necessity, or else we must stop the great works of the Government and paralyze these industries.

For one, sir, the cry of economy will not prevent me, until we shall have a navy such as this country ought to have, from voting for appropriations and creating a navy of which the whole American Republic will be proud, and which is necessary for our commercial interests both at home and abroad.

The question arises, have we gone too far? Is it proper for us

to do less than the Committee on Appropriations have recommended? There are four ships which are provided for here, smaller vessels, which not only the Secretary of the Navy states but which is known to all men are absolutely necessary for our commercial success and for the proper conduct of our affairs in foreign waters south of us, and in Japan and China, if we are ever to have any further relations with China. Those four vessels, I take it, are absolutely necessary, and the appropriation for torpedo boats for defense, the defense of our harbors, which are open to attack from any man-of-war which may enter them, ought not to be questioned by anyone.

So we come back to the great ships which have been discussed by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. McPHERSON]. He desires ships of a different type, not battle ships. We are compelled to take the judgment of the experts, the naval architects, who have done so much, who have done so well, who have astonished the world in what they have accomplished, in whose success, I confess, in the beginning I had but little faith, yet who have revolutionized the naval architecture and construction of the whole world, aided to no small extent by the genius of our mechanics in private establishments.

Mr. President, the experts say that the class of vessels which we provide for in this amendment are necessary, and that their construction is the one proper thing to do. I am content to take their judgment. I think the Senate ought to take their judgment. To show what has been accomplished in the matter of the construction of engines alone for these great ships I have a statement, which can be verified by the data at the Department, in the domain of engineering construction of the machinery, that when the Chicago was designed in 1833 by the Advisory Board, which, as stated by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], was the finest marine engine afloat at that time, five-horse power to the ton of machinery was all that could be developed. Under these experts such improvements have been made that in the Newark, which was designed in 1889, constructed by Cramp & Sons, of Philadelphia, they have developed twelve-horse power to the ton of weight. It is not necessary for me to go on and describe what they have done in the way of the construction of vessels. Their work is known to all the world.

I do not believe that there is a single American, no matter what his politics may be, who is not proud of the success which we have achieved, and prouder still of the fact that while \$59,000,000 have been expended by the Democratic Administration and by this Administration, no man has ever intimated that a dollar of it has been misapplied, or that there has been wasteful extravagance in its expenditure. If that be true, and if it be further true that the commercial interests and every interest in this country require the Navy to be enlarged, then I see no reason why this appropriation should not be made as recommended.

It is possible, it is probable, that in view of the condition of the Treasury and of the desire to economize, which is strong with the party to which I belong, and to which we are committed by every declaration it has made, it may be feared that we have gone too far, and that in the end we may not get all that this committee think and all that I think ought to be appropriated; but, at all events, I think the Senate will have discharged its full duty to make the attempt to go as far as this amendment proposes.

Mr. COCKRELL. To which amendment does the Senator refer?

Mr. GORMAN. To the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations—and let the result be what it may. I believe that with the desire of economy, which is entertained most thoroughly in the other end of the Capitol, the result will be that we shall get a sufficient appropriation to enable this great work to go on and keep our shops moving and our forges in blast, and that within a few years all the other establishments will be able—as I said a moment ago that great establishment in Baltimore is able now—to keep themselves in full blast and their mechanics all at work in the construction of vessels, not only for war but for commerce also.

Mr. McPHERSON. A single word in respect of some of the observations of the Senator from Maryland.

I understood him to say that while our expenditures of money seem to be very great, there seems to be no possibility whatever of the reduction of expenditures, and therefore there necessarily must be an increase in taxation. As there is no alternative whatever between large expenditures by Congress and large taxes upon the people, and as we have shown here to-day, I think, conclusively that there is really no necessity in this country demanding this expenditure of \$10,000,000 for this particular class of ships, I will suggest to the Senator that even in this bill alone \$10,000,000 might be stricken off, which would certainly avoid \$10,000,000 more of taxation.

The Secretary of the Navy himself declares that there seems

to be no particular necessity for any more cruising ships at present. I read from his report in order that there may be no mistake about it. I think this was sent to Congress in 1890. Speaking of the number already provided for, on page 2 of the report communicating to Congress the report of the Naval Policy Board, he says:

For an increase in the number of cruisers, considered simply as auxiliaries to the fighting force of battle ships.

And that is the only reason given for increase. He says further:

We may wisely wait until the latter are in process of construction.

We added, as I say, two new cruising ships through another process, in case the Government shall need them, the City of Paris and the City of New York, in the bill which passed here last week. We have a prospect that five more ships of that line may be added to the force of cruising ships, which would at least take the place of seven cruising ships that we might construct, which will cost the Government nothing to maintain, except we put them into the naval service, while the naval ships we build are requiring money all the time for their maintenance and to keep them in condition for sea service.

Mr. President, I can see no demand anywhere in this broad land for these battle ships, except a demand which comes from the owners of private ship yards and from naval officers.

Well, if the people of this country are to be taxed and their taxes increased at the command of the owners of private ship yards and naval officers of this country without any regard whatever to the needs of the country or the demands of the people, which is simply protection along the seaboard and sufficient cruising ships to carry the flag and protect American commerce, then the people should at least know how and to what extent their money is squandered. Of foreign commerce we have none; and as we are not at war with any naval or commercial power, do not expect to be, and will not be, if we can avoid it without the sacrifice of the national honor, then it seems to me as though we might cut off \$10,000,000 here, in this bill alone, without injury to any interest.

I have no desire to cripple the progress of building up a new navy. I have voted for all the appropriations for the increase of the Navy, except for the three battle ships in the bill of 1890. I did not vote for those ships, and shall not vote for similar ones until the people of this country can feel that they have some security against invasion, until they are furnished with vessels especially adapted to harbor and seacoast defense, which, as I have already stated, need never go into commission at all, except for practice or to meet an invading enemy, and thereby avoid the great expense which the Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH] in his able address made here in 1890 shows conclusively how to avoid, and that is by not building battle ships. If this money is to be so applied I am in favor of withholding the appropriation. I will not vote to further increase the taxes of the people in order that these monster ironclads, for which we have no need whatever, may be built.

Therefore, sir, I felt that I was justified in proposing my amendment when I found this bill reported from the Committee on Appropriations with a large increase for a class of ships, especially one, which I think we do not need. As to the harbor-defense vessels which have been provided for by the amendment of the committee, I shall gladly vote for them. I thought I was justified in reducing the appropriation by changing the character of the ship to one that would require no expense for its maintenance in comparison with the other, a ship which would afford protection to our coast, as we have cruising ships enough, and, if not enough, they are coming to us much faster than we can build them through the commercial marine which will soon be under our control and in which a commencement has been made.

Mr. President, we are told by the Senator from Maryland that there can be no reduction at present in expenditures. The country was amazed a year ago when it was discovered that in two years we had spent here in Congress nearly a billion dollars. As a result of that extravagant and reckless expenditure of money the people revolted against the party in power, and sent an enormous majority to the House of Representatives pledged to reduce expenses and to reduce, so far as it could be done, the taxes which had been imposed upon the people of this country.

If this protective system is to be increased and extended in order that we may continue these appropriations of money from the public Treasury for all objects and purposes, whether necessary or not, worthy or unworthy; and especially in order that a lot of private shipyards may have a profitable business to do, and in order that naval officers may have exactly the ships they want or none, then I think it is time the Senate changed its policy, ere the people turn their dogs of war loose in this end of the Capitol.

We have had reported here to-day a bill for rivers and har-

bors, carrying twenty-three and odd millions of dollars, I believe. Does any Senator upon this floor believe that one-half of the money which that bill carries is necessary in order to protect or increase the commercial advantages of the people of this country? In my opinion, that bill can be reduced \$10,000,000 and still cover every single object of national importance as to rivers, harbors, and ports.

Mr. HALE. Where does that bill come from, except from the very House that the Senator has just said was elected pledged to economy?

Mr. MCPHERSON. Very well. I am not blaming anybody except those who are responsible for it. I have not charged the Senator's political party with it yet, but I expect to have the opportunity to do that very thing in a day or two.

Mr. President, I am not in favor of increased taxes upon the people. I can not vote for these unnecessary appropriations of money, whether it be for ships, for rivers and harbors, or for any other purpose, I care not what. Thousands of dollars are being appropriated day after day in appropriation bills and other legislation which, in the present condition of the Treasury, should be postponed. We have reached a point when the people are groaning under taxation too grievous to be borne.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, the amendment which the Senator himself proposes involves more money than the amendment reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator is quite mistaken in that. The ships which I propose to build can be built for two and a half million dollars each.

Mr. HALE. The ships the Senator proposes to build will each cost four and a half million dollars. He provides for three of them, which will make thirteen and a half million dollars. He strikes out of the Senate Appropriation Committee's amendment one battleship, which will cost \$5,000,000, possibly \$5,500,000, and the armored cruisers provided for by the House of Representatives, which will cost three and half millions each. If there is any arithmetic by which the Senator can figure out that he is, with all his claim for economy, reducing the appropriations and making the future appropriations for the Navy less by his amendment than the Senate Committee on Appropriations has made it, he must take a set of figures that I can not agree to and figures that will not be borne out by investigation. A harbor-defense ship of this kind can not be built for anything less than four and a half millions of dollars.

Mr. MCPHERSON. My answer to the Senator is found in the reports of the cost of vessels of like character. If he will take the report of the cost of the *Monadnock*, the *Miantonomoh*, or the *Puritan*, which is a vessel of 6,000 tons, of which the vessels I propose to build are to be a type and of the same character, only increased a little in size and displacement, he will find the cost of the ship, and then he will find that I have underestimated the probable cost of these ships. I shall be convinced when he shows me the figures.

Mr. HALE. The double-turreted monitors the Senator refers to are of an entirely different class. Neither the Senator nor anyone else wants to build a 3,000-ton ship like the *Miantonomoh*, the *Monadnock*, or the *Terror*, the only one of the large ships which does not come within 2,500 tons of the size his amendment proposes shall be built as monitors for harbor defense. The only large one is the *Puritan*, and she stands to-day as representing a cost of more than \$4,000,000.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken about that. The *Puritan* is a 6,000-ton ship, and she will not cost four millions, even though built by pieces and has been twenty years in constructing.

Mr. HALE. I am not mistaken. It will be more than \$4,000,000 when the armor is placed upon her. You can not build a good monitor, a harbor-defense ship, and armor and arm her with suitable armament, for less than from four to four and a half million dollars.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I will not take issue with the Senator about that question. My proposed amendment had one advantage, and that was it proposed to accomplish something; it proposed to give the people of this country, who are to-day unprotected, some protection in our ports and harbors. The proposition of the Senator from Maine is that they are to have none. The proposition from the beginning in regard to this whole naval increase has been that there was a determination to begin the construction of immense great floating war ships, carrying an iron mine upon their ribs, floating around the ocean, hunting for a battle with somebody or a quarrel with somebody in some part of the world, and the owners of our private shipyards were to have the profits of building them. That was the secret.

As I said before, during the administration of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], who was the Secretary of the Navy under Arthur's Administration, and under the administration of Mr. Whitney, who was Secretary of the Navy under

Cleveland's Administration, neither one of those Secretaries asked for money for the construction of a great iron monster like these ships we are now building. We built three of them under the appropriation bill of 1890.

I read from the speech made in 1890 by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. DOLPH], in which he stated that the cost to build a single battle ship and keep it in commission during the lifetime of the ship (twenty-two years) would amount to over \$22,000,000, and the cost to keep in commission the three ships which you have already built for twenty-two years, the probable lifetime of the ships, will be \$66,000,000.

Mr. President, I propose to build three harbor-defense ships in lieu of the cruiser and the battle ship. They will cost about two and a half or three million dollars each. I propose to locate them at some of our great principal seaport cities, with a proper complement of naval officers to care for them and take them out for practice, and man them, if you please, with our naval militia, a volunteer force who will go out and practice with these ships, and they never need to leave port except to meet an invading enemy or for practice. Compare those ships, compare their efficiency with these monster ironclads sailing about the world, compare the cost of the maintenance of these ships, and then the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] can find a spot where he can reduce the expenditures of this Government and save the people from much loss and from additional taxation.

That is the policy I intend to pursue so far as I have the power to do it; but, as I said before, I am not willing to stop naval increase, but in my simplicity I thought I might stop this reckless extravagance, this heedless and useless method of applying the people's money, and devote it to something practical and something for which the people would receive a benefit. Whether it be adopted or not, I shall be found here voting (if alone) in favor of it. I shall not go home to my people in New Jersey and say to them that I have not been able to reduce the taxes imposed upon them, and, moreover, that I have not tried to do it.

I shall make the best effort I can in behalf of lower taxes, in behalf of a reduction in taxation, and also the best effort I can make in changing the mode of taxation, by which more of the taxes that are now imposed upon the people shall find its way into the public Treasury, instead of into the pockets of private manufacturers and other people in this country who surround this Capitol at every session of Congress demanding favors.

Mr. GORMAN. Mr. President, I confess that I am utterly amazed at the statement of my distinguished friend from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON], with his well-known accuracy in all these matters. I confess my astonishment that he has construed anything which I have said into an advocacy of extravagant appropriations.

I started with the declaration that I and the party to which I belong were committed in every declaration, in every promise which it had made, and every vote which we had given to an economical administration of this Government.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Did not the Senator state—because I do not mean to do him injustice, and if the Senator did not so state the RECORD will perhaps show my mistake—that we found it impossible in the condition of the Treasury to reduce the appropriations, and that they were fully equal to the appropriations of two years ago, made in the first session of the Fifty-first Congress? Did he not also state, as a necessary corollary, that increased appropriations mean increased taxes? The money must somehow or other go into the public Treasury before it can be paid out by order of Congress, because certainly it is nothing but an order of Congress. I understood the Senator to state that since we could not reduce expenditures, as a necessary corollary of that we must increase taxes.

Mr. GORMAN. Well, Mr. President, I made practically that statement. I repeat it. I said that we had assembled here in this Congress with one House in thorough political accord with the Senator from New Jersey and myself, earnest, honest men, who are determined so far as they can to carry out every promise which the Democratic party has made. They are engaged in that work now, and will continue so engaged, as I believe, until the termination of this Congress. I made the further statement, however, that the statutes now upon the books, the laws which have been passed, together with the appropriations that must be made to defray current expenses, compel appropriations to the extent of \$500,000,000 for the current year, and that it is not in the power of the Democratic party to stay it or to reduce it.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Will the Senator please tell me what he means by the laws in force? Have there been laws passed in this Congress or in any preceding Congress which require that we should collect from the people of this country \$500,000,000 this year to pay expenditures?

Mr. GORMAN. I mean to say, Mr. President, that there is no power on earth, as the Government is now constituted, to enable

the Democratic party to reduce the appropriation of \$150,000,000 or more for pensions; there is no power in the party to which he and I belong to reduce the fixed expenditures of the Government, the interest on the public debt, etc.; there is no power on earth to reduce the expenditures for offices; there is no power to reduce taxation, and you can not diminish expenditures. You have no power as long as the Government stands divided between the great parties to do any one of these things, and the country ought to know it.

When the Senator from New Jersey, with all of his standing and power, rises in his seat and intimates that I am in favor of extravagant appropriations in the advocacy of this amendment or in these appropriation bills, the facts do not justify the statement.

If I understand this case, Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has been arguing here for types of ships which he thinks are the proper ones to be constructed for the defense of the country and for its commercial interests. It is a question between him and the Navy Department as to the character of ship, not as to the cost. If I understand this case—and I have given it some attention—I supposed that I was in a position of antagonizing my friend from New Jersey and the Naval Committee which he represents on this floor for the reason that they had recommended and insisted upon more millions than I was willing to place in this bill, or than the Committee on Appropriations were ready to place in it.

Mr. HALE. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey involves nearly double the expenditure proposed by the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GORMAN. Nearly double the expenditure, as I understand. The Senator from New Jersey and the Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously, without regard to party, as I understand it, wanted double the number of ships and double the amount of money. When the subject came to the Committee on Appropriations, I, for one, there as here, said and say now that I am not content to paralyze and stop this great industry, but I am not ready to go to the number of millions recommended by the committee of which the Senator is an honored member and the spokesman on this floor.

I am not content that he shall place me in a position of being for extravagant appropriations. I say the conditions are such that the party to which I belong can not reduce these appropriations and they must not be held responsible by the country. We can not repeal laws; they are there upon the statute books; we are in the minority in this Government; we have one branch of it, but there is another, under the control of another party, and the Executive stands in our pathway.

Neither reduction of expenditures nor reduction of taxation can come during this Congress, and the great issue between the two parties is fixed in the minds of the people of this country. We may tamper with it; we may have homeopathic bills looking to reduction; we may argue the question and keep it alive, but the people of this country know full well what those issues are. They were made in the platform of 1888, and they have been reaffirmed in every platform adopted by every Democratic convention held since 1888. They will stand until victory is won by one side or the other.

The people of this country know what the issue is. On one side is a party which has been in power, with every branch of the Government under its control, which has fixed the expenditures at too high a rate, as we think. But they are fixed, and can not be repealed or modified until the country gives to the Democratic party every branch of the Government. We are not to be held responsible for what goes on to-day. The Senator from New Jersey does great injustice to me and a wrong to his party when he throws out the intimation that we can do better now, because the fact is that it is impossible to do better.

Mr. GEORGE. Does the Senator desire to be understood that there are now upon the statute books, laws of the land, provisions of law which require, in order to keep the public faith, the annual expenditure of \$480,000,000 or \$500,000,000.

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, practically that. If we are to continue to run the Government and provide for the officers and the machinery which are already fixed by law I do say that, unless you arrest all improvements of rivers and harbors and suspend the construction of the Navy.

I said a moment ago, when I first addressed the Senate, that my distinguished friend, the senior Democratic member of the Committee on Appropriations, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL]—immediately after the adjournment of the last Congress, when the newspaper press and the thoughtless orator on our side of the political question were proclaiming and denouncing the extravagance of the Fifty-first Congress, and stating to and misleading the public that if we secured the House of Representatives we would cut down the appropriations \$100,000,000—the Senator from Missouri, with the foresight which char-

acterizes him, came out in a publication in the public press in which he demonstrated that no matter when we had the House of Representatives, that reduction was impossible. It is too long for me to read the article now, but it ought to be made a matter of record; and with the permission of the Senate I will incorporate the statement made by the Senator from Missouri in my speech.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Leave will be granted in the absence of objection.

The statement referred to is as follows:

SENATOR COCKRELL'S STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS BY THE FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS.

WASHINGTON, April 20, 1891.

Republican party organs have been doing what they can to make capital out of recent interview with Senator FRANCIS M. COCKRELL of Missouri concerning the extravagant appropriations made by the last Congress and what may be expected from the Fifty-second Congress, with its Democratic House and its Republican Senate.

In that interview Mr. COCKRELL said that on account of the laws enacted by the Fifty-first Congress he did not see how any very great reduction from its appropriations could be made by its successor. By magnifying the latter part of this statement and belittling or suppressing the reason given for it by the Senator, the organs have sought to make Mr. COCKRELL appear to be testifying that the Republicans were not lavish, and therefore not open to criticism for their billion-dollar appropriations. The gross misrepresentation of what Mr. COCKRELL said has led the Senator to prepare a detailed statement of just what was done by the Fifty-first Congress toward draining the pockets of the taxpayers, giving particular attention to the burdens which were put upon the next Congress by the enactment of laws requiring future appropriations.

"The aggregate of the appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress for the fiscal years 1891 and 1892," says Mr. COCKRELL, "according to a statement prepared by the clerks of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, is \$988,410,129.55, including \$224,115,391 as the estimated amount of the permanent annual appropriations for those two years, being \$101,628,453 for 1891 and \$122,486,938 for 1892.

"In the Book of Estimates of all appropriations deemed necessary for the administration of the Government—required by law to be submitted by the Secretary of the Treasury to Congress at the beginning of each regular session—submitted in December, 1889, the permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal year 1891 were estimated at the sum before stated and so included in the statement of the aggregate I have given.

"But in the Book of Estimates for the fiscal year 1892, submitted in December, 1890, showing the items of the estimated amounts of such appropriations for 1892 and for 1891 and the appropriations for 1890, the aggregate of the permanent annual appropriations for 1891 was stated at \$123,703,149.72, an increase over the former estimate made in 1889 of \$25,074,696.72. This increase was not included in the aggregate of all appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress, and should be added to that aggregate, because it arose from the laws of that Congress and the Executive Administration.

"I have compared the two estimates for 1891, submitted in December, 1889 and 1890, respectively, and find that in the estimates submitted in December, 1890 there are twenty-eight new and increased items and twelve decreases. The principal decreases are in the items sinking fund and coinage of the standard silver dollar, while the principal increases are in interest on public debt \$500,000; sinking fund, Union Pacific Railroad Company, \$550,000; repayment to importers, \$2,000,000; drawbacks or bounties (not sugar bounty), \$1,000,000; army transportation, \$100,000; operating canals, etc., \$200,000; 5, 3, and 2 per cent fund to States, \$150,000, and fees of supervisors of election, \$10,000; and the new items are bank-note redemption fund, \$20,000,000; expenses of Treasury notes under law July 14, 1890, \$306,000, and coinage of silver bullion, \$150,000.

"Upon the passage of the law of July 14, 1890, called the silver bullion law, there was in the Treasury the sum of \$54,207,975.75, held in trust to redeem the notes of national banks, which sum, by that law, was covered into the Treasury, increasing the surplus by that amount, and such notes were thereafter to be redeemed from the general cash in the Treasury, appropriated as a permanent annual appropriation. I give these facts, that all may understand them clearly.

"In addition to this sum of \$25,074,696.72, there should be added to the aggregate of appropriations, at the lowest estimate, \$15,000,000 for refunding the direct tax to the various States under the law of March 2, 1891, and also \$4,000,000 for the proceeds of the sale of the old custom-house in New York City, appropriated toward the construction of a new house.

"By adding these three sums, aggregating \$44,074,696.72, to the aggregate of the other appropriations of the Fifty-first Congress, we have the startling sum of \$1,032,484,826.27. Truly it can be called the billion Congress. Ex-Senator Gen. John B. Henderson of Missouri could very appropriately have used the language attributed to him in the public press as follows: 'As a Republican, I think the extravagance of the Congress just adjourned was an outrage upon the party and the people. However the appropriations may be justified, the fact that they reach \$1,000,000,000 is of itself appalling. No such enormity of appropriations has been voted since the war, and occurring in a time of profound peace, as this is, and when the greatest economy was demanded, no excuse can be offered for the extravagance.'

"In the aggregate I have given is included an appropriation of \$25,321,907.35 for pension deficiencies of the fiscal year 1890, appropriated by the Fifty-first Congress, which, being charged to the Fiftieth Congress and credited to the Fifty-first Congress, still leaves the aggregate of \$1,007,162,918.92 chargeable to the billion Congress. In this statement I have not included the indefinite appropriations for pay of two and three year volunteers, for bounty to volunteers, their widows and heirs, for bounty under act of July 28, 1865, and for commutation of rations to prisoners of war, which claims are being audited from time to time and paid out of the indefinite appropriation therefor, which will probably amount to about \$2,236,000, nor a supposed deficiency of about \$3,000,000 which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue reported January 15, 1891, would probably be required to pay the sugar bounty for the fiscal year 1892, in addition to the permanent annual appropriation of \$7,000,000.

"I give the Fifty-first Congress credit for the pension deficiency appropriation for the fiscal year 1890, although the Fiftieth Congress appropriated the amount estimated for that year, just as I shall charge to the Fifty-first Congress any deficiency in the pension appropriation for 1892, although the Fifty-first Congress appropriated the entire estimate.

"In order to realize the enormity of the appropriations of the billion Congress it is important to contrast those of the Fiftieth Congress, when the House was Democratic. The aggregate of the appropriations of the Fiftieth Congress for the fiscal years 1889 and 1890, as prepared by the same clerks, is \$817,963,859.90, to which I add the pension deficiency for 1890, which I have credited to the Fifty-first Congress, being \$25,321,907.35, and increasing the aggregate to \$843,285,766.25. In this aggregate is included a pension deficiency

of \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year 1888, appropriated by the Fiftieth Congress for that year, and properly chargeable to the Forty-ninth Congress and to be credited to the Fiftieth Congress.

"In the same aggregate of the Fiftieth Congress the permanent annual appropriations for the fiscal years 1889 and 1890 are estimated at \$231,331,854.85, while the actual expenditure, as shown by the Treasury Department reports, was only \$200,514,420.03, leaving an excess of appropriations over actual expenditure of \$32,817,434.82, to be credited to the Fiftieth Congress.

"Deducting these two sums, amounting to \$27,317,434.82, from the aggregate of the Fiftieth Congress, we have \$815,868,337.43 charged to that Congress, which, being deducted from \$1,007,162,918.92, shows an excess of the appropriations by the Fifty-first Congress over the Fiftieth of \$191,194,591.49.

"About the 1st of September in each year the Treasury Department prepares a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government up to the close of the last preceding fiscal year, which does not include the revenues of the postal service nor its expenditures, except only the cash actually paid from the Treasury. The Post-Office Department collects its revenues and expends them without placing them in the Treasury. By this Treasury statement the total expenditures for the fiscal years 1889 and 1890, including sinking fund, were \$936,243,701.76, to which we must add the expenditures of the Post-Office Department from its revenues in excess of the cash drawn from the Treasury, as shown by reports of the Postmaster-General, amounting to \$116,731,649.31, making the aggregate expenditures for those two years \$812,975,351.07.

"What may be the actual excess of expenditures under the appropriations and laws of the Fifty-first Congress over those of the Fiftieth Congress no one can now estimate with accuracy. We can not now tell what deficiencies for 1892, and even for 1891, may be reported to the coming session of the Fifty-second Congress, to be provided for and chargeable to the Fifty-first Congress. The expenditures from the permanent annual appropriations may and most probably will exceed the estimates. Some years they are greater and some less than the estimates.

"Permanent annual appropriations are such as are required by general laws to be paid from the Treasury and are not named in the regular annual appropriation laws, and are called 'specific' and 'indefinite.' The 'specific' are those which fix the exact amount to be expended, and are for the Smithsonian Institution, for collecting revenue from customs, and for arming and equipping the militia, aggregating \$5,942,180. The 'indefinite' are for numerous objects, such as for the sinking fund, for interest on the public debt, for repayments to importers, excess of deposits for customs, for drawbacks and allowances, for bounty on sugar, for redemption of national-bank notes, and for colleges for agriculture and mechanic arts, and whatever sum is necessary for the object named is appropriated without naming the exact amount for each year.

"The Treasury Department annually, in its Book of Estimates, submits to Congress a statement showing the objects and the amount estimated to be necessary for each object, and the total amount of all the estimates which is in the calculations of the appropriations of each year, added to them, although not named. In 1888 the expenditure exceeded the estimate over \$7,000,000; in 1889 was less by over \$1,500,000; in 1887 exceeded by \$4,500,000; in 1888 was less by over \$6,000,000, and in 1889 and in 1890 was less by over \$24,000,000, as before stated.

"The largest of the increased appropriations by the Fifty-first Congress over the Fiftieth Congress in the appropriation laws are as follows: Agricultural, increase \$1,441,473.50; fortifications, increase \$2,802,144; Indian, increase \$7,307,146.70; legislative, increase \$1,456,633.12; navy, increase \$14,042,344.69; pension, increase \$113,312,351.69; Post-Office, increase \$22,668,343.58; rivers and harbors, increase \$2,738,678.10; sundry civil, increase \$15,530,499.72.

"In regard to the pension item, it must be noted that, in the statements of appropriations for pensions for the two Congresses, those of the Fiftieth Congress are stated at \$175,017,400 and those of the Fifty-first Congress at \$288,329,751.69, which gives the above increase. To ascertain the actual increase in pension appropriations for each Congress, we must, from those of the Fiftieth Congress, deduct \$3,500,000 pension deficiency for 1888 appropriated by the Fiftieth, but chargeable to the Forty-ninth Congress, and add \$23,321,907.35 deficiency for 1890, appropriated by the Fifty-first Congress and charged to the Fiftieth Congress, and credit said last amount to the Fifty-first Congress, which being done leaves for the Fiftieth Congress \$196,839,307.35, and for the Fifty-first Congress \$263,007,844.34, and shows the actual increase to be \$66,168,536.99, provided there be no deficiencies for 1892.

"The enormity of its appropriations of the people's money must not make us overlook the laws the billion Congress enacted, and thereby laid mortgages and legal liabilities upon the people for years to come. The McKinley tariff law grants a bounty to the producers of sugar from beets, sorghum, or sugar cane or maple sap of 2 cents per pound testing not less than 90° by the polariscope, and 12 cents per pound testing less than 90° and not less than 80° from July 1, 1891, to July 1, 1905, and makes a permanent annual appropriation of whatever sum may be necessary to pay such bounty. The estimate submitted in December, 1890, to pay such bounty for 1892 was \$7,000,000.

"What such bounty will amount to for 1892 and subsequent years can not be estimated with any approach to accuracy. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, in his report of January 15, 1891, says: 'It is believed that the bounty to be paid under this act during the next fiscal year will not fall much short, if any, of \$10,000,000.' It seems almost certain that it will largely increase from year to year and add to the burdens of the future.

"An act to provide for ocean mail service between the United States and foreign ports and to promote commerce, approved March 3, 1891, authorizes the Postmaster-General to enter into contracts, for a term not less than five nor than ten years, for the carrying of mails on American steamships between the ports of the United States and such ports in foreign countries, the Dominion of Canada excepted, as in his judgment will best serve and promote the postal and commercial interests of the United States, to be equitably distributed among the Atlantic, Mexican, Gulf, and Pacific ports, and divides the steamships into four classes, according to construction, speed, and tonnage, and provides that the rate of compensation for such service per mile shall not exceed \$4 for the first class, nor \$2 for the second class, by the shortest practicable route for each outward-bound voyage, nor \$1 for the third class, nor two-thirds of a dollar for the fourth class, for the actual number of miles required by the Post-Office Department to be traveled on each outward-bound voyage.

"In the Post-Office appropriation law for the fiscal year 1892, the amount for transportation of foreign mails was increased over the estimate of December 1, 1890, by \$497,010. The amount which may be required to meet the contracts the Postmaster-General may make for the fiscal year 1892 and subsequent years will depend entirely upon the number of steamships so contracted with. It is safe to say that the amount for 1892 will exceed the appropriation, and will increase from year to year, for years to come—for there is no limit as to the time when the Postmaster-General shall make contracts, the only limitation being as to the length of the contract from the time made.

"An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations, approved March 3, 1891, confers upon the Court of Claims jurisdiction to adjudicate such claims and render judgments therein against the United States and the band or tribe of Indians committing the wrong, if identified, to be paid from annuities of Indians, if any, and

if not, then by the United States. The estimate of the aggregate of such claims varies from eight or ten to twenty millions. The future alone will disclose for what amounts and during what years the Court of Claims may render payments in such cases.

"In the deficiency appropriation law of March 3, 1891, \$1,304,095.37 was appropriated to pay the findings of the Court of Claims on the particular claims therein named for indemnity for spoils by the French prior to July 1, 1801. These were only a small part of the aggregate of all such claims.

"The cost of the public buildings authorized to be erected by the Fifty-first Congress, as fixed and limited in the respective laws, and the increase of cost made by the Fifty-first Congress in public buildings previously authorized, over and above the limit of cost fixed in the original laws, amount to \$17,046,639.54, and the appropriations made to \$8,886,635.54, leaving \$8,160,000 to be appropriated hereafter. This does not include the New York custom-house, authorized to be sold for not less than \$4,000,000 and the proceeds appropriated to construction of the new building.

"The river and harbor appropriation law of the last Congress authorizes contracts to be made for construction, etc., of works at Galveston, Tex.; St. Mary's River, Hay Lake Channel, Philadelphia, and Baltimore, estimated to cost \$16,123,979, and only appropriated \$4,791,200, leaving \$11,331,779 to be provided hereafter.

"Under the pension law of June 27, 1890, over 600,000 applications have been filed, and hundreds are being filed daily. Many of these applications are by applicants or pensioners at low rates under the old law. The actual expenditures from the Treasury for pensions, for the years named, have been as follows: For 1885, \$56,102,267.49; 1886, \$66,404,864.03; 1887, \$75,029,101.79; 1888, \$80,288,508.77; 1889, \$87,624,779.11; 1890, \$106,936,855.07. The appropriations for 1891 are \$127,763,059.34 and for 1892 are \$135,214,785.

"Will there be a pension deficiency for 1892, and an increase in the aggregate amount of all the pensions for several years thereafter? Known facts answer yes. The increases for several years past have been as follows: In 1889 over 1888, \$7,336,270.34; in 1890 over 1889, \$19,312,075.96; in 1891 over 1890, \$20,556,204.27, and 1892, according to the estimates submitted in December, 1890, and appropriated for the increase over 1891, is only \$7,421,725.66. No claims under the law of June 27, 1890, are included in that fiscal year. If the Pension Office shall dispose of the hundreds of thousands of pending claims with dispatch and promptness, there will be a deficiency for 1892 and considerable increases for years to come under existing laws.

"The actual expenditures of the Post-Office Department, including revenues and cash from the Treasury, have been as follows: For 1880, \$36,542,803.08; 1886, \$51,004,743.80; 1889, \$62,317,119.36; 1890, \$66,259,547.84; and the appropriations are, for 1891, \$72,226,698.90, and for 1892, \$77,907,222.61.

"The liabilities for 1893 and 1894 and subsequent years by reason of new lines of railways, new post-offices, and star-route service, free-delivery service, and the ocean mail service, under the law before referred to, will be largely increased.

"The Fifty-first Congress created 1,951 new specific offices with specific salaries amounting to \$2,359,215, and omitted or abolished 246 specific offices with specific salaries amounting to \$310,894.18, leaving 1,705 as the net increase of new specific offices with specific salaries amounting to \$2,048,320.82. It increased the salaries of 1,216 specific offices by \$251,353.12, and reduced or decreased the salaries of twelve specific offices by \$3,028.30, leaving 1,206 specific offices with a net increase of their salaries amounting to \$247,724.82 annually. The salaries of the net increase in new specific offices and the net increase of salaries in specific offices will amount to the sum of \$2,296,075.64.

"It also appropriated the amount of \$2,942,351.50 for new officers created by increase of appropriation, or other law, without specifying the number of such officers or the amount of each salary, and withheld or omitted appropriating \$41,240 for officers without specifying the number or the salary of each, leaving a net increase of \$2,901,111.50 annually. The aggregate of such new officers' salaries and increase of salaries is an increase of \$5,197,187.14 annually.

"The Secretary of the Treasury will submit to the first and second regular sessions of the Fifty-second Congress, in December, 1891 and 1892, respectively, his Book of Estimates of the amounts of all appropriations required for the administration of the Government under the existing laws for each of the fiscal years 1893 and 1894, respectively, and also all estimates for deficiencies for the fiscal years 1892 and 1893, respectively. The estimates of each Department for its entire service will be made out by such Department and submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury, who will consolidate the estimates and submit them in one book to Congress.

"These estimates will form the basis from which the House will make the various appropriation bills for the different departments. The aggregate amount of the permanent annual appropriations for each year, though not specified or named in any annual appropriation law, will be charged to that session of Congress and be added to the aggregate appropriations of such session, as I have before explained. It is safe to assume that these estimates by Republican officials for their own administration will be amply sufficient to cover all expenditures under existing laws without any deficiencies.

"At no one time nor during any one Congress since March 4, 1861, has the Democratic party had control of Congress in both Houses and of the Executive. During the Fifty-second Congress we will control the House only, and have a Republican Senate and Executive. At no one time, therefore, has the Democratic party had full power to enact any law. Every bill, whether originating in the House or Senate, must, before it can become a law, be passed by each House and approved by the Executive, or, if vetoed, be passed over the veto by two-thirds of each House.

"Our Democratic House of the Fifty-second Congress has no power to enact any law, or to repeal, amend, or modify any existing law, without the approval of the Republican Senate and Executive. The House has the exclusive right to originate all bills for raising revenue, but the Senate has the same rights of amendment as on other bills. The House exercises the right to originate the appropriation bills, but the Senate has full power of amendment and equal power with the House in passing all bills, and if no agreement can be reached the bill fails.

"The sovereign people, as well as the Democratic members of the Fifty-second Congress, should calmly and dispassionately consider and understand in advance the serious conditions growing out of the appropriations and laws of the billion Congress, and the Republican control still of the Senate and the Executive, which must be met and removed before any very great reductions can be made in the apparent aggregate of appropriations and the expenditures of the Government be reduced to that economical and legitimate basis demanded by the best interests of our Government and of the great masses of the people."

MR. GORMAN. For that statement at that time thoughtless people denounced the Senator from Missouri and held him up to ridicule, and extreme men went so far as to charge him with apologizing for what our opponents had done; but he did a wise thing in the interests of his country and in the interests of his party by letting the truth be known, for we are confronted with it to-day, and the results have justified what he said.

Mr. GEORGE. Now, I should like to ask the Senator another question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. GORMAN. With great pleasure.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator speaks of the impossibility of reducing expenditures, because the laws already existing require them to be made. I should like to ask the Senator if he sees in the laws already in existence an extravagance which ought to be corrected by the repeal or modification of those laws?

Mr. MILLS. With the permission of the Senator from Maryland I will say that there is a provision of a law on the statute book requiring an expenditure of public money which is absolutely ignored, and that is that part of the law which requires about \$50,000,000 of the public debt to be purchased and applied to the sinking fund every year.

Mr. GORMAN. I am obliged to the Senator from Texas. Why, Mr. President, the expenditures of this Government are growing year by year.

Mr. GEORGE. Are they justly growing?

Mr. GORMAN. Yes, sir; I take it for granted they are justly growing.

We had an Administration recently in power a member of which is now a member of this body. I believe that it was as honest an Administration as we have ever had since the adoption of the Constitution. We had four years of that Administration. We were hampered, it is true, by not having all branches of the Government. We only controlled the House of Representatives and the Executive branch, but, after all, when it comes to the expenditure of money for the ordinary administration of the Government, the economies which must be introduced and practiced are with the Executive branch. It is on their recommendations and estimates that appropriations are made.

Now, let us see, because we want to be exactly fair in this matter, how those expenditures increase. I have a table of the appropriations for each fiscal year.

Mr. CULLOM. What years?

Mr. GORMAN. I will give the Congresses, beginning with the Forty-third Congress, which was in 1875-'76:

The total appropriations for that Congress were	\$653,794,000.21
For the Forty-fourth Congress, 1877-'78	595,597,832.28
For the Forty-fifth Congress, 1879-'80	704,527,405.98
For the Forty-sixth Congress, 1881-'82	727,537,684.22
For the Forty-seventh Congress, 1883-'84	777,435,948.54
For the Forty-eighth Congress, 1885-'86	655,269,402.33
For the Forty-ninth Congress, 1887-'88	746,342,495.51
For the Fiftieth Congress, 1889-'90	817,963,859.80
For the Fifty-first Congress, 1891-'92	988,417,183.34

It will be seen from this statement, which was prepared by the clerks to the Committees on Appropriations for the two Houses, that there has been an increase in the appropriations each year since 1877-'78, with the single exception of the years 1885-'86. No matter which party is in power, as the country grows and you go on with the construction of your Navy, as you open the harbors and deepen the rivers, and as you make your great guns for the Navy and for the Army, these, together with the permanent appropriations and pensions—the expenses will not decrease.

How can the expenditures be decreased, says the Senator from New Jersey or the Senator from Mississippi? They will decrease when you reach the point, which must be within a year or two, of stopping the further construction of your Navy, of having enough guns on hand to place in forts, of having enough torpedo boats to protect your harbors, and when you can reduce your appropriations for your rivers and harbors. There can be and there will be, as there was under the late Democratic Administration, a large decrease in the matter of officials, if you please. When it comes to pensions, outrageous as it was to increase them to the extent we have done, they are fixed until the period arrives by the operation of time alone by which they can be decreased. But, Mr. President, the pensions will increase, largely increase, during the next four years. Both sides of this Chamber must face these stubborn facts.

The Senator from New Jersey says that he would not increase the taxes of the country. How can we prevent it? Your revenues are about \$450,000,000 under the operations of the law. Your expenditures at this Congress, in which our party originates the bills, will be \$500,000,000 and more. Decrease expenditures, Mr. President! The Senator from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has reminded me that the Treasury would be without money to-day but for the fact that the present Administration has taken the fund which ought to have been, and was under prior Administrations, set aside for the redemption of the national-bank notes which are to be retired and also the sinking fund for paying the public debt, which is a thing now of the past, as the surplus is a thing of the past. How can the condition of things be bettered?

Why, Mr. President, there is not a Democrat, and I hope there are but few Republicans, now left who do not know that the condition can be bettered and will be bettered when the Democratic party comes into power and remodels the revenue laws, which we think operate unjustly and keep from the Treasury and put in private concerns the money which ought to go into the Treasury. The revenue laws will not be adjusted and can not be adjusted now. The only way to secure a proper adjustment is to tell the people of this country the truth, that we are powerless now in this Congress to give them relief from extravagant appropriations, as they have been considered, or from unjust tax laws. Relief can only come when we shall have every branch of the Government.

Mr. President, the Senator from New Jersey has asked me, how can we reduce these appropriations which we are now considering? As anxious as I am, as firmly wedded as my party is to economy, I do not understand the history of the party to be one of obstruction, of doing nothing, of paralyzing legitimate enterprises, of striking at vital points, of preventing an increase of our commerce or making thorough preparation for defense. I understand our party to mean by economy and retrenchment that the people's money shall be used only for public purposes; that it shall be honestly expended; that extravagance and profligacy shall be checked.

I do not understand that we are committed to parsimony; I do understand that we are in favor of every proposition which looks to the advancement and glory of this great country of ours; I understand that every Democrat wants the public money honestly expended, and when it is so expended, as I stated it had been in the construction of the Navy from the day that Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated until this hour, they are in favor of building up the Navy.

The Senator from New Jersey asks why we desire to keep up the private shipyards. Are we to make an appropriation to keep them going? No, sir; but that is the inevitable effect of the system developed by a Democratic Administration.

Mr. President, in 1883 there were but three shipyards to offer to construct a ship. We were without a single forge or rolling mill which had produced plates, angle bars, beams, etc.

There was not a single forge capable of making the necessary shafts and other heavy forgings; not a foundry prepared to undertake the required steel castings. In a word, the construction of the new Navy was a new industry; or, at least, new conditions of an existing industry, so radical and comprehensive that it amounted practically to the same thing.

A review of our situation in detail, and an account of the efforts by which the obstacles were surmounted, would, when fully described, be interesting, and no further proof would be required to show the indomitable will, courage, and skill of the American shipbuilders.

As late as 1886 we brought from abroad the armor for the turrets of the Miantonomoh. Forgings for 8 and 10 inch guns were purchased from Whitworth.

The steel shafts for the Charleston were made by Krupp, and those for the Baltimore, Yorktown, and Vesuvius by Whitworth.

To depend upon English and German forges and machine shops for such essential elements of national defense was intolerable; was humiliating; it could not be tolerated.

The cost of plants to make us independent was not taken into account. What the people demanded were war ships constructed from stem to stern by American shipbuilders out of steel furnished by our own forges.

Of the earlier attempts it is not necessary to speak. The difficulties were met, the want of skill and appliances are now fully recognized. Look at the result—the proposal for several thousand tons of heavy steel armor and forgings for guns. It resulted at once in the expansion of the plant at Bethlehem until it has a capacity at this time hardly excelled in the world as to extent; as to quality of output, nowhere equaled. The Midvale Steel Works of Philadelphia now furnish forgings for the largest guns. The Homestead Works of Pittsburgh have the capacity to make the heaviest armor plate of the highest quality.

The Steelton Works, near Baltimore, is another great industry, prepared to furnish the material and construct ships. There are other plants in Chicago, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama soon to be in active competition with those I have named.

The production of cast steel for stem posts, engine bedplates, and other like large castings is now admitted to be at least abreast with similar works anywhere in the world. In 1885 they could not be produced in this country.

No one in the Democratic party wanted to continue to buy from Whitworth; nobody that I know, no matter what his politics, was content to rely upon English or French or German forges, but desired that we should have forges here in this country, so that we could make our own war vessels and build our own ships for commercial purposes. That policy could not be inaugurated unless the Government began its work of constructing a navy;

and when you appropriated that \$59,000,000, as by magic there sprang up these great establishments.

In addition to those in Pennsylvania and at Baltimore, there is one on the Pacific coast, where, under the control of a native Marylander, a genius as a constructor of ships, there was produced that great plant on the Pacific coast. Is there an American who is not proud of those works? I rejoice as a Democrat that so much was accomplished under Democratic auspices, and that by the spending of money honestly and faithfully these great works have sprung up.

The natural result has been that we have establishments prepared to build ships for the commercial marine of this country, ships equal to any which float upon the ocean, and it has not been ten days since the Democratic House, true to the traditions of its party, passed a bill to admit two great ships to American registry on condition that two others of equal tonnage, to be built in American shops, should be put upon the ocean, thus completing the record of the Democratic party, which is that there has not been, with one exception, a line of great steamships on the ocean carrying the American flag which has not been put there because of legislation passed by a Democratic House of Representatives.

Sir, that is the history of the party. The words of the Senator indicate his impression that the proposed legislation is for the benefit of shops which are to construct these vessels. We have not given them a single dollar of bounty to make their shops. We have paid them fair prices for all they produced. The Senator knows, for he is on the Naval Committee, that until last year we had not the capacity or the skill in this country to make the shafts for the great war ships which are now afloat, that we brought them from abroad, and that the policy inaugurated by Mr. Whitney has produced the result of which I have spoken. The Senator is too just and patriotic not to rejoice with me at this result.

Mr. President, in the present Secretary of the Navy we have an example of generosity and high treatment of a predecessor which has never been surpassed before in the history of the Government. In every report which he has submitted to this Congress he has said to the American people that the foresight and the wisdom of the Democratic Administration which had preceded him had produced these results, which were a marvel to the world, and that for those grand vessels which are now afloat Mr. Whitney is entitled to great credit for the wisdom and foresight with which he made the contracts with these very establishments.

Mr. President, it will not do to higggle here about these great matters. We can here and there reduce an appropriation; we can refuse to make appropriations for new works and new enterprises; but the Democratic party can not, with only one branch of Congress under its control, reduce to any considerable extent the general appropriation bills, whose aggregate will be about \$500,000,000, made necessary by laws for which we are not responsible. The better plan is to tell the people of the country the truth, that we are powerless, until they give us the control of the Government, to largely reduce expenditures or change the iniquitous tax laws which oppress them.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Mr. President, a single word in reply to the Senator from Maryland. When that Senator first took the floor to address the Senate upon the pending bill I understood him to make a statement which I am sure he would scarcely like to have go to the country as representing his views.

The Senator stated that there would be a deficiency of twenty-five or thirty million dollars, and that, as there was no chance in the world to reduce expenses, the natural consequence would be that taxation must be increased. He further went on to convey the idea not only to myself but I think to others that he would be in favor of supporting such a policy.

I did not think the Senator meant that, and I intended to give him an opportunity of saying to the Senate just what he did mean, because I am sure the Senator favors the Democratic idea in government, which means a frugal government. Above all other things, I favor a Democratic Administration and a Democratic government in this country, for without it I think we should have universal bankruptcy in a few years. It is a pretty well-established fact that when an individual or a people begin to expend more than they earn the result is final bankruptcy and ruin.

Mr. President, I have not charged the Senator from Maryland with any desire, with any action, or with any intention of favoring private shipyards. I spoke of the fact incidentally that the shipyards in this country had been vastly interested in furthering the building of this great line of battle ships in order that they might profit by it. I had said that the naval officers were opposed to the building of the Ericsson style of ship, because they do not contain all the toilet rooms and bathrooms and other comforts so necessary to satisfy a naval officer.

I said, moreover, that I was not in favor of listening to the demand of the shipbuilder nor the naval officer. I wanted to

build a sensible ship for harbor defense. It seems I have not been able to do even that without being charged with increasing the appropriation, and it has been insisted upon that my proposition tended to increase the appropriation.

When I ask for two more ships to be added to the naval appropriation bill, the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] says one of them will cost \$4,000,000. We appropriate for one battle ship \$5,000,000, we appropriate for a vessel for harbor defense \$4,000,000, and for a cruising ship three and a half million dollars, which makes twelve and a half millions, but, according to his own statement, if my amendment had been substituted for his, he says my two ships would cost \$8,000,000, and that I am only saving \$4,000,000; but according to my estimate, if my ships shall cost six millions, there will still remain a large balance in my favor.

Still, it has been thrown out here by the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Maryland that my proposition was to increase the naval appropriation, when all in God's world I have asked was to put on two ships which can not cost above six millions, and take off two for which the bill grants eight and one-half millions. In addition to that, the Senator from Maine reported from his committee in favor of one of the ships which is included in my amendment.

Mr. HALE. The two ships that the Senator seeks to put on will cost more money than the two he proposes to strike off.

Mr. MCPHERSON. According to the Senator's own estimate, the ships provided for in the bill are to cost \$8,500,000. According to my estimate the ships I propose will not cost more than \$6,000,000.

Mr. HALE. Your two ships would cost \$9,000,000.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I take issue with the Senator, and I say that my ships need not cost any such sum. But it will be remembered that the Senator's committee provided for one of the very character of ships which I propose to build.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me—

Mr. MCPHERSON. One moment. Wait until I complete my statement.

The Senator provides for a battle ship to cost \$5,000,000, for a cruising ship to cost \$3,500,000, for a ship for harbor defense to cost \$4,000,000. That makes \$12,500,000, according to my poor arithmetic.

Mr. HALE. Now, how does the Senator leave it?

Mr. MCPHERSON. I propose to put on two harbor-defense ships, which I say will cost \$2,500,000 each, or say three millions.

Mr. HALE. The Senator proposes to have three harbor-defense ships, including the one which the Committee on Appropriations reported. This simply, as I say, strikes out two ships and leaves in the harbor-defense vessels that we provided for, so that the Senator does not save anything there. That leaves it as we put it. Then the Senator puts in two harbor-defense ships, instead of the battle ship, a protected cruiser, and the two ships he puts in will cost when finished and armed \$9,000,000. The two ships he proposes to strike out will cost eight and a half million dollars.

Mr. MCPHERSON. The Senator might just as well fix the value of the ships, I suppose, at \$19,000,000 as \$9,000,000.

Mr. HALE. I do not give this price arbitrarily. It has been arrived at by thorough examination in the Navy Department. The Senator seems to forget that these harbor-defense ships are only 1,500 tons smaller than the battle ships. They are of the same class of vessels; they are great, huge, thickly plated, heavily armored ships, with only 1,500 tons difference in price. That makes less than a million dollars of difference in the cost. Every one of his proposed ships would cost four and a half million dollars, and the battle ship only between five and five and a half million dollars. The Senator may figure until doomsday and any child in arithmetic may repeat the process, and he will find it as I state it. It strikes out two ships and puts in two more, and his ships will cost over a half million dollars more than the two he proposes to strike out.

Mr. HALE. But the Senator has been setting himself up and claiming immense credit for reducing expenditures and for representing the economic side, when he is dealing here with a proposition which increases rather than reduces the appropriation.

Mr. MCPHERSON. Then let us pursue a different policy. If we are bound up, as the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] tells us, by prior legislation, which has not only mortgaged the money in the Treasury but the future also, I think it is high time we began to cut down the appropriations. Let us strike out everything in your naval bill and begin anew, for I infinitely prefer that that course should be adopted than that we should proceed to build any more battle ships. Let us be able to say that if this Congress is bound in chains the next one shall not be by any action of ours.

Mr. MILLS. The Senator wants to strike out both amendments?

Mr. McPHERSON. Yes; strike them all out. Certainly there is no law which can compel us to put them in or to pay for them if not built at all.

Mr. President, I intend to take up, at an early day, the question of the amount of mortgage which has been placed on the resources of this country, which consists in bounties to be paid to steamship lines, bounties upon sugar, and things of that character, but I can not pursue that topic to-day.

Mr. CALL. I did not propose to detain the Senate at all in this discussion, and I now merely wish to say that in the present condition of this country, in the impoverished state of the people, in the general distress which pervades the whole agricultural community, I am opposed to any increase of appropriations of any kind whatever. I should vote against this bill with the additional increase put upon it, and I should vote to strike out the provision placed in the bill by the House for the building of another ship.

It may be true that we are bound by the legislation of the Congress preceding us to continue the large expenditure which has been forced upon the people of the country, but it is the imperative duty of this Congress to respect the cry of the people and the general distress, and to investigate with great care the possibility of reducing every appropriation for the public expenditure.

For myself I shall not vote for any increase upon this bill, and should, if the opportunity were afforded, gladly vote to strike out the provision made by the House.

Mr. VILAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Maine, a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, what is the number of ships now under contract for construction under previous laws?

Mr. HALE. I think the number is twenty-four.

Mr. VILAS. About twenty-five, is it not?

Mr. HALE. Twenty-three or twenty-four, I think.

Mr. VILAS. What is the amount which has been contracted to be paid for the construction of those vessels, and of that amount what part has already been appropriated and what part remains to be appropriated?

Mr. HALE. I do not know that I can give now the exact figures. The total appropriations up to the present time, including the appropriations for the present year, represents about \$59,000,000. To complete the ships that are now being constructed will cost, I should say, somewhere from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000.

Mr. VILAS. Is the sum of from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000 necessary to complete the ships now in course of construction already appropriated?

Mr. HALE. Not all of it.

Mr. VILAS. How much remains to be appropriated?

Mr. HALE. I say the future appropriations, I think, are somewhere from \$20,000,000 to \$25,000,000. I only carry the figures in my mind from having read them in the reports. I do not claim to speak definitely as to the amount, but it is in the range of what I am stating.

Mr. VILAS. I should like also to inquire within what time the additional appropriations necessary to complete the ships in process of construction must be made?

Mr. HALE. I think most of the appropriations will be made during the next fiscal year. I do not mean for the year that we appropriate for now, but for the year succeeding and the year succeeding that; so that in 1893 and 1894 they will practically be closed up.

Mr. VILAS. One question further, by the courtesy of the distinguished Senator. Is it correct that after the vessels shall have been completed which are now under contract we shall have thirty-nine war vessels, some of them of a very fine grade and most of them of modern construction?

Mr. HALE. Yes, we shall have a little more than that number.

Mr. VILAS. There is no immediate war anticipated, I believe?

Mr. HAWLEY. There never was.

Mr. HALE. The Senator knows as to the question of war that most of the wars that have occurred, not only in his memory and mine, but as brought down to us in history, have not been contemplated until they were actually present to the people. All the work that has been so well referred to by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN], in the Administration of which the Senator from Wisconsin was a distinguished member, was not upon the basis that there was an immediate war on the horizon with any particular power. We went on under Mr. Cleveland and gave all the money that was asked, and the Republican Senate was glad to do it, and I think it was a wise thing.

I think the policy that has been pursued, which has been so well described by the Senator from Maryland, who looks at this matter not from a political point but from a broad patriotic standpoint, has all been wise. There never was a time when we were appropriating money for these new ships under the former

administration that the Senator from Wisconsin, then at the head of an important Department, or I here in the Senate, or anyone else could have pointed out where there was danger of immediate war. Congress and the administration started upon reconstructing the Navy and the project was popular with the country. It captivated not only the imaginations of men but their reasons, broad and large. Out in the Senator's State, I fancy, as well as in mine, and on the coast, the people were gratified that there was an evidence shown to them that as we grew in power we were going to develop a navy so that if any possible contingency brought about war we would not be unprepared for it.

That is all the reason which can be given to the Senator. When he asks me if any war is just now hanging over the horizon I am bound to say I do not know of any, but we have had uneasy moments within the last six months. There have been times when in men's minds there dwelt not as a chimera but a well-founded actual apprehension of trouble with other powers, and what has been done and the situation and condition we are in now prevented the United States, with its 70,000,000 people, from being bullyragged by a little South American power, which, if it had possessed, as it did at one time, a respectable navy, and we had had none, would have had its hand at our throats and we would have been at its mercy.

I do not need to discuss this question with so enlightened and intelligent a Senator as the Senator from Wisconsin. He knows that it is not the apprehension of immediate war with any one power, but he must recognize as I do that hereafter the United States is not to be in that domain of isolation from foreign powers that it has been for the last thirty years. We are coming nearer to other people, forming commercial alliances, and entanglements, if I may use the word, may come about at any time. We can not count upon that exemption from trouble, danger, and war we have been counting upon for the last twenty-five years. We are endeavoring in a patriotic way to keep on with this work of rebuilding the American Navy, and, as has been so well explained by the Senator from Maryland, who, as I said, looks upon this whole project in a broad and statesmanlike view, we are doing it now in a moderate way.

The questions the Senator from Wisconsin has asked as to the amounts of money that are to be expended do not in any way bear upon the proposition that is presented here by the Appropriations Committee. It is a mild proposition compared with what was sent to it by the Naval Committee or what was desired by the Department.

Mr. VILAS. I only wish to observe in reference to what the distinguished Senator from Maine has said, and well said, that as to the danger this country would have been in from the little nation of Chile on the southern coast, his statement seems to be another crown of praise to the administration of Secretary Whitney, and the preparation he made for it enabled the present Administration to save this Government from the injury and the humiliation that would otherwise have been suffered under the Navy which Secretary Whitney found when he entered upon his administration.

Mr. HALE. All administrations have been doing this thing. It did not begin with Secretary Whitney. The administration of the Navy Department under Secretary Chandler, who now represents the State of New Hampshire in part upon this floor, was engaged in the same work. It was not its fortune to launch the ships and get them out upon the seas, but it projected them and made the beginning of the Navy in a most fair, open, able way. It was followed by Secretary Whitney, who showed great administrative force at the head of the Department, and his hands were all the while sustained and upheld by Republicans here in the Senate. Although we controlled the body at that time, I am gratified to remember that I then joined hand in hand with the Senator from Maryland in sustaining and upholding the hands of Secretary Whitney. When under the political mutations of the last Presidential election that Administration went out and our Administration came in, it is to his credit and the credit of other Democrats that they joined in sustaining and upholding the hands of Secretary Tracy, who has proved a most admirable Secretary of the Navy and commands the confidence of Congress.

Therefore it is that, unlike other Departments, the Navy Department has been most fortunate in commanding the trust of Congress and in having ample, not extravagant appropriations given to it. It is not any one party that is entitled to this credit. It is the good fortune of the Republican party that they had such Secretaries as Secretary Chandler and Secretary Tracy, and it is to the good fortune of the Democratic party that they had so good a Secretary as Secretary Whitney. We all of us participated and have taken part in the programme and are doing it now. I hope that it will not cease; and whatever is the result of the next Presidential election, if we go out and the Senator comes in with his party I have no doubt there will be a

strong head of the Navy Department and that we shall be found here upholding his hands as the Democrats are now upholding Secretary Tracy's hands, and that until we get a great navy, not an extravagant navy, not an overloaded navy like some of the great powers of the world, but a respectable navy of the best ships that float on all seas, whoever is in power will be sustained not only by Congress but by the patriotic impulse and sentiment of the American people.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I am tempted to express my profound satisfaction with the general tone of this debate. It shows that without regard to party the Senate of the United States at least is right on this great question. But I wish to make a little historical observation here, that there may be no disagreement among friends about this matter, which is that two years and a day before Mr. Cleveland became President, in the naval appropriations approved March 3, 1883, under the Arthur Administration, Congress provided for the construction of the Chicago, Atlanta, Boston, and Dolphin in the first act for the reconstruction of the new and glorious Navy.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. President, a distinguished citizen of the United States said a few years ago that it was a condition and not a theory which confronted us. It is a condition and not a theory that is confronting us to-day. The Treasury is bankrupt. That is an acknowledged fact. No one disputes it. That condition did not exist when Mr. Whitney and Secretary Chandler were building vessels for the Navy. A very different condition then existed. We had an enormous surplus piling up in our public Treasury. It had to be spent. It was wise policy to put that money in circulation again. It would have been very unwise and almost a criminal piece of statesmanship to have continued that money piled up in the public Treasury and deplete the circulation of the country, making it impossible to carry on its business, making it impossible for debtors to pay their debts; and it was right and proper that that money should be taken out of the coffers of the Government and restored to circulation.

But that is not the condition which confronts us to-day. The Treasury Department reports to the Senate and House of Representatives the fact that the Government is bankrupt. It no more places upon its reports among its assets and liabilities the money required to purchase the bonds to apply to the sinking fund, and that law is as positive and as imperative as any law upon your statute books requiring appropriations of public money.

It has been the established policy of the fathers of the Republic from the first President to the last that the public debt of this Government must be paid, and as rapidly as possible. All the Administrations have plumed themselves in trying to reduce that debt and reduce it as rapidly as it could be done without injury to the people by unjust taxation.

For the first time in a number of years we are confronted with a condition where we have stopped purchasing the bonds for the payment of this debt as provided by law, and we quietly, without the least criticism, without the least protestation, without the least complaint from anybody, have fallen into a position where we are going to perpetuate our public debt. Fifty million dollars is stricken from the amount of the necessary expenditures of the Government, and the people have to pay this continued interest on the public debt annually instead of appropriating the money and paying the obligations of the Government.

Notwithstanding that, sir, here to-day, with this fact known to every Senator and every member of the House of Representatives, it has been stated to the whole country that we are bankrupt. If this was a private corporation instead of a public one and subject to the jurisdiction of courts it would be in the hands of a receiver. Yet to-day in this condition we have a bill before us appropriating \$10,000,000 to build a navy, and the debate is going on in the Senate as to whether the appropriation shall be for battle ships or cruisers. I say, strike it all from the bill and let the Government come back to that lesson which all governments as well as individuals should learn and observe, to live within your own income. It is bankruptcy to attempt to live beyond your income.

If you intend to pursue this policy one of two things is absolutely necessary. You must increase your taxation or borrow more money on bonds and pay more interest. There is but one wise course for us to pursue, and that is to stop where we are, cut down all expenditures that can be possibly cut down, bring the expenditures of the Government inside of its income, and keep it there rigorously.

We are not threatened with war. The mission of the Republic is peace. We have no boundaries to adjust with foreign dynasties. No standing armies are upon this continent confronting us and menacing the liberties of our people. Vast oceans lie around us. We have built up a great Government to secure the liberties of our people. Peace, commerce, and honest friendship Mr. Jefferson announced as being the mission of the Republic. We want commerce, and before we proceed to build vessels to plow the sea with them, to display the flag of

the Republic, let us emancipate our commerce and let the commercial marine of the Republic be seen on all waters and in all quarters of the earth; and then if that commerce is menaced, or if the peace and security of any of the citizens on the decks of our vessels are imperiled, it will then be time to put on the armor of war.

The whole affair that we had with Chile seems to have alarmed some portion of the people of the United States. Our people are too fond of war anyway. Some portion of them are too hair-triggered about war. That matter could have been adjusted and it was adjusted without war. It would have been a war, if we had been forced into it, from which we could have gathered nothing but shame and disgrace. There was a little republic that had grown up under the protection of the very doctrines which we had planted on this continent and in this hemisphere. It lived by our example, followed in our footsteps, attempting in her own civilization to climb behind us and ascend to the same great height to which we had ascended. But in one of those moments that must happen in the history of all people she lost her temper, as we were in danger of losing ours. All that was needed to settle that question was time, the healer of all things, to soothe the distemper, to silence the bad disposition of her people, to quiet down and let reason resume her sway. That was done at last and the matter was settled.

We do not want any war with anybody and we are not in danger of having war with any one. There is no necessity to incur this great expense, especially at a time when we have no money to pay it with. If we proceed as we have been going we shall soon have to borrow money to run the current expenses of the Government.

What is proposed by the statesmen who have charge of the Government and those who are responsible? What is proposed to be done with the public debt of the United States? That is a very serious question. I agree with the Senator from Maryland that it is impossible for the House of Representatives to refuse to appropriate money if they have money to appropriate under existing laws. It is our duty to appropriate the money and to show that we are a law-abiding body, or it is our duty to repeal the laws.

If the laws are in force, they exact obedience from the legislator as well as from any other citizen of the country. Here are the laws in force making these permanent appropriations. Here is a law enacted more than thirty years ago standing upon your statute books, which has been observed from year to year up to the present time, requiring you in carrying out the ancient policy of the American fathers to get your country out of debt as soon as possible when it gets in debt; and yet you quietly drop that code out of sight and refuse even to parade it on your monthly public-debt statement as a part of the liabilities of your Government. Why shall it not be paid?

Suppose that we should refuse to pay the interest on our public debt, you would hear a howl all over this land. You would hear even here in this body that the public faith had been abandoned. You would hear that the Government and people of the United States were faithless to their obligations to the public creditor in refusing to pay the interest. Why? Because the public creditor wanted the interest paid. But when you propose to buy the bonds in the interest of the people of the United States, you can drop it out of sight and no one raises any complaint about it.

Our obligations are just as binding to the people of the United States as they are binding to the public creditors upon the people of the United States, and it is our duty to redeem every obligation of this Government, whether it is made to its creditors or whether it is the obligation that we as representatives are under to our people who are our constituents.

Something, sir, must be done. The people of the United States will demand that this debt shall be paid. Some steps have got to be taken to pay it, and the first step to be taken is to economize your expenditures, live entirely within your income, live as economically as possible, and apply every dollar of surplus to the payment of debts that have matured, and, if there are none that have matured, buy those that have not matured. That is one question which now presents itself before us. It is one about which we have got to think; and it is for that reason that I am opposed to making any unnecessary appropriation until the expenditures of the Government come strictly within its income.

Mr. HALE. It is late, and unless we can have a vote now and dispose of the bill and pass it—

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not do that.

Mr. HALE. I shall not seek to detain the Senate any longer.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can not finish the bill to night. That is impossible.

Mr. HALE. Then I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 16, 1892, at 12 o'clock meridian.